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Abstract

Conceived within the frameworks of cultural-historical activity theory, systemic functional linguistics, and situated literacy, this study investigates the form and function of writing conferences in a university foreign-language class, focusing on the relationship among the teacher-student discourse in conferences, students' subsequent text revisions, and other factors affecting their modes of engagement with the writing activity.

The study involved 9 students who, over the course of 1 semester, composed texts on 3 different topics as part of classroom activities. Then in conferences with the teacher, they discussed their first drafts, produced second drafts, and, in interviews, reflected on the processes involved. The main sources of data consisted of audio-recordings of the conferences, the students' written products, both first and final drafts, audio-recordings of 3 retrospective interviews, and a questionnaire concerning their ethnolinguistic background. The triangulated sources of data were analyzed through the combined use of quantitative and qualitative methods.

Overall, the analyses pointed to the positive effects of the tripartite writing activity. The students as a whole utilized the majority of specific pointers offered during the conferences to revise their first drafts. They also reported the metalinguistic and metacognitive value to them of engaging in the process. Quantitative analyses of the conference discourse and of the relationship between the discourse and the students’ revisions showed that the manner in which the students engaged in the writing-related activities was strongly influenced by the revision goals they set themselves, the topics
selected for discussion in the conferences, and their target language proficiency.
Additionally, qualitative analyses of 5 mini-case studies revealed that, in accounting for the
students' differential performance, other factors, which appeared to cut across the
proficiency differences, interacted with their target language proficiency in an intricate yet
dynamic way.

The study suggests the importance of: (a) exploring teacher-student interaction in
terms of discourse theory; (b) examining overall patterns of intertextual relationships
between students' text revisions and talk around their texts; and (c) taking account of the
multiple contexts that shape and are shaped by the writing activity. Methodological and
pedagogical implications are also discussed.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

My interests in discursive practices in the classroom, writing, and interpretive research are intertwined with my personal and professional life. Over the past ten years, through my lived ESL experiences as a newcomer to Canada, a second-language (L2) practitioner, and a graduate student, I have come to realize the extent to which my ‘commonsense’ knowledge about ‘proper’ behavior is a cultural construct, resulting from my participation in the sociocultural practices of my country of origin. As Bakhtin (1981) notes, “language is not an abstract system of normative forms but rather a concrete heteroglot conception of the world” (p. 293). Despite the fact that I was a competent member of Japanese society, in a new country, I found myself once again a “legitimate peripheral participant” (Lave & Wenger, 1991) who was trying to appropriate culturally valued ways of knowing and acting.

My status of “legitimate peripheral participant” (LPP) permeated all aspects of my life in my newly adopted country. In my teaching, instead of familiar, homogeneous Japanese EFL students, those enrolled in my Japanese-as-a-foreign-language (JFL) classes were heterogeneous with respect to linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In contrast to the predictable responses from my Japanese EFL students, there was a much wider range of student responses than I was used to. This diverse student population had different needs, expectations, and values. I had to learn quickly to fine-tune my instructional language according to different groups of students. I did this instinctively as a classroom teacher.

While I was trying to adapt to a new way of life and teaching, I also embarked on my graduate studies in education, in particular L2 education. Yet another major adaptation awaited

---

1 According to Bakhtin (1986), language learning is inherently dialogic: We know our native language - its lexical composition and grammar structure - not from dictionaries and grammars but from concrete utterances we hear and that we ourselves reproduce in live communication with people around us. We assimilate forms of language only in forms of utterances and in conjunction with these forms (p. 78).

2 In contrast to L1, the language dominant or preferred use in daily life, ‘second language’ (L2) and foreign language (FL) refer to non-native languages. The term ‘L2’ has been increasingly applied for all types of non-native language learning. However, it seems necessary to distinguish these two terms in the context of this study. According to Stern (1983, pp. 15-17), while L2 refers to a non-native language learnt and used by the learners’ speech community of residence, FL refers to a non-native language learnt and used with reference to a speech community outside the national territory where learners reside (see also Klein, 1986, pp. 19-20). Stern also points out that L2 learning usually takes place with much more environmental support since it is used within the learners’ community of residence, whereas FL learning lacks this support. Hence, FL learning “usually requires more formal and other measures compensating for the lack of environmental support” (p. 16).
graduate studies in education, in particular L2 education. Yet another major adaptation awaited me. This time, it took the form of a language barrier. For several years, my limited proficiency in spoken English prevented me from contributing to discussion in graduate seminars. Spontaneous, prompt response in an academic setting was more challenging than vernacular English. On the other hand, I read extensively in English, which gave me a sense of empowerment. It was through these sustained literate activities, combined with many social interactions in the L2, that I gradually became able to participate in academic discussion more fully. However, writing remained problematic for a number of reasons. First, apprenticing myself into the culture of a specific disciplinary discourse community took time. Just like any other graduate student, I spent many hours reading articles and books in my specialized field to develop a sense of the norms and conventions of this community. Along with learning a new written genre came the need for substantially modifying my sense of audience. What I thought constituted good writing, i.e., leaving some things unsaid so as to not offend the reader's intelligence, was evaluated as a cryptic, unpersuasive piece of writing. I needed to re-envision the audience as intelligent people who expected me to explicate my thoughts fully and to take them step by step through my argument. Second, linguistic errors and/or incoherent statements that might have gone unnoticed or forgiven in conversation mercilessly stared back at me in my written text; indeed, my numerous drafts were improvable objects (Scardamalia, Bereiter, & Lamon, 1994) that begged for re-working. I learned first hand just how difficult it is to compose and revise in a L2. Notwithstanding this difficulty, I also discovered the potential of writing as a way to develop my thinking and to attend to my language use in the L2. This realization prompted me to become interested in writing research and writing pedagogy.

This threefold adaptation to new ways of saying, meaning, and acting in a novel environment highlighted the socially constructed nature of knowledge and human action. As Geertz (1973) put it, "the shapes of knowledge are ineluctably local, indivisible from their instruments and their encasement" (p.4). This recognition became the basis for my approach to L2 research. That is, I came to consider research as an "interpretive science in search of meaning, not an experimental science in search of laws" (1973, p. 5) and at the core is the activity of understanding (Verstehen). There is not a world of social facts waiting to be discovered, observed, described, and analyzed; instead, the inquirer constructs the meaning-making process of those under study. Language, cognition, and culture are an irreducibly interactive, hermeneutical phenomenon that solicits interpretation and the inscription or thick description of human actions. In a graduate course on L2 collaborative learning, I was introduced to sociocultural theory, on which I subsequently came to draw as my theoretical
practices of society and individuals' intellectual development as novices participate in ongoing joint activities. Stressing the social origin of human mental functioning, Vygotsky (1978) argued that human development occurs through participation in purposeful collaborative activities, mediated by others and their use of semiotic tools (e.g., language, graphs, etc.). This perspective brought to the fore the link between social interaction and students' learning, with which I had been grappling, particularly in relation to linguistically and culturally diverse students.

Guided by this situated view of learning, I conducted a series of classroom inquiries in my classroom to understand local circumstances, to relate theory to practice, and to test the validity of claims made by researchers in a naturalistic classroom environment. I analyzed classroom discourse and students' writing in my JFL classes. Based on the findings of one study, I introduced new activities and pedagogical techniques which, in turn, led to another inquiry. In this way, the cycle of action research projects was set in motion. When it came time to design my thesis study, I decided to conduct a larger-scale action research project involving students that I had known well. I decided to investigate teacher-student interaction in JFL writing conferences, students' subsequent text revisions, their views on writing activity, and other specific contextual features that shape and are being shaped by writing practices in my classroom. In so doing, there were a number of issues I wanted to address and incorporate in the research:

1. to pursue my interests in classroom interaction (e.g., teacher-student dyadic interaction) and L2 students' writing development;
2. to devise a framework for analyzing teacher-student dyadic interaction that would advance our understanding of the meaning making processes in such a setting;
3. to put forward a framework for analyzing the link between the conference discourse and text revision, both quantitatively and qualitatively;
4. to explore how students perform, and reflect on, the writing activity under investigation;
5. to address both the collective and the individual's participation as well as the interaction between the two;
6. to develop a contextualized view of FL writing practices by theorizing contexts within cultural historical activity theory, which is based on the works of Vygotsky, his students, and neo-Vygotskians;

Criticisms have been leveled against practitioners' classroom inquiry. For instance, Applebee (1987), one of the leading researchers on L1 writing, argues that because teacher inquiries lack the methodological rigor of 'professional' research, such inquiries do not yield valid or replicable findings and consequently contribute little to the 'knowledge-base' of the discipline. Despite this criticism, I believe that classroom inquiry is a valid form of research and I hope that my thesis study attests to it.
between the two;

6. to develop a contextualized view of FL writing practices by theorizing contexts within cultural historical activity theory, which is based on the works of Vygotsky, his students, and neo-Vygotskians;

7. to learn together with the participating students instead of doing research on them;

8. to design my action research so as to ensure improvement in the quality of learning for the participating students in the local setting; and

9. to contribute to an empirical base of L2 research.

1.2. Outline of the Thesis

The thesis is organized into seven chapters. Following this brief introduction, in Chapter 2 I review several strands of relevant research and their implications for this study, leading to the statement of research purpose and research questions. In Chapter 3, I document the methods of the research. Chapters 4 and 5 examine the evidence related to the three research questions (see Section 2.8) and report findings. In Chapter 4, I report the results of analyses pertaining to research questions 1 and 2 concerning the analysis of the conference discourse, the students’ text revision, and the link between them. Focusing on the students as a group, the analyses in this chapter are primarily quantitative in nature and aim to establish general patterns in the data. By contrast, Chapter 5 presents qualitative analyses of five mini-case studies; it addresses the third research question regarding multiple factors involved in the students’ participation in the writing activity. Following that, in Chapter 6, I discuss issues arising from the analyses reported in chapters 4 and 5. This chapter comprises three sections: (a) the issues raised in the analyses of the conference discourse; (b) the issues related to text revision; and (c) developing a situated understanding of writing activity in terms of cultural-historical activity theory. The final chapter first presents a summary of findings for the three research questions, and then discusses theoretical and pedagogical implications of the present study.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews relevant literature that informed this study. The review consists of four main sections: (a) theory and practice of foreign-language writing; (b) research on revision and teacher feedback; (c) the perspective of situated literacy; and (d) the perspective on language use and conversation. At the end of each section, the implications of the previous research for this study are presented. Then, additional theoretical perspective, statement of purpose, and research questions conclude the chapter.

2.1. FL Writing: Theory and Practice

This section presents a review of theory and practice of FL writing with respect to adult students in higher education settings. My aim is twofold: first, to sketch out what has been done and what needs to be done in the future in theory and practice of FL writing and, second, to frame the current study based on the implications derived from the review.

2.1.1. Writing Practices in FL Classrooms

While the ESL profession has been directly affected by new writing emphases within the mainstream English-teaching profession (i.e., process writing and writing across the curriculum), the FL profession has not been equally involved in development of FL writing proficiency (see Heilenman, 1991). Historically, the FL teaching profession in North America “has given little sustained attention to the development of writing ability in students’ target languages” (Valdes, Haro, & Echevarriaza, 1992). Writing is “the most poorly understood” dimension of FL competence to which only “the most cursory attention” is given in FL education (Terry, 1989, p.43). Dvorak (1986) has argued that, within the FL profession, what little attention has been paid to writing has been primarily focused on producing “correct” forms and on “transcription” rather than on “composition”. Writing in FL classrooms, particularly at lower levels, has been largely a “handmaid” (Rivers, 1981), and writing in the sense of creating meaning has been noticeably absent (Nerenz, 1979). To borrow Kaplan’s

---

5 My review of FL writing research is limited to FL learning with respect to adults, and it does not address FL writing in immersion contexts.

6 See Harlow and Muyskens (1994) for what FL students and teachers consider as priorities for intermediate-level FL instruction.
(1982) distinction, "writing without composing" has dominated FL instruction rather than "writing through composing". However, there have also been some attempts in FL teaching to shift from the view of FL writing as a production of sentence-level, error-free text to a more communicatively oriented view (e.g., Gaudiani, 1981; Hewins, 1986; Landa, 1993; Magnan, 1985; Omaggio, 1986, 1993; Scott, 1996).

Underlying the limited conceptualization of FL writing and attendant practices is the context in which FL education occurs. In addition to the limited amount of target language input available to FL students in the immediate environment, there are other situational factors to take into consideration: (a) since a large proportion of FL students do not attain advanced-level proficiency (this is even more the case in less commonly taught languages), there is a strong tendency for reduced expectations with respect to mastery of writing; (b) there are few immediate communicative needs for the use of FL in students' lives; (c) overall instructional time is limited; and (d) FL classes tend to operate independently from other content subjects. These factors combine "to make writing, in the sense of composing, a minor focus in the overall fabric of instruction" (Heilenman, 1991, p.274). For instance, in an FL context, Omaggio (1986) recommends the use of process-oriented composing tasks only at the advanced and superior levels of proficiency as defined in the ACTFL/ETS writing scale.

Heilenman (1991) argues that given that the majority of FL instruction in North America concerns beginning to low-intermediate levels of proficiency in FLs, "the pedagogy as well as the research generated in native language composition and college-level ESL classrooms has quite literally little or no applicability in FL instruction" (p. 274) and that "generalizing results found for fairly advanced ESL and EFL students to FL students may be questionable" (p. 281). At the same time, she proposes an integrated approach to FL writing to replace the traditional, compartmentalized instruction, in which writing is used as "a convenient means of verifying student performance in other realms":

"[W]riting in the sense of creating meaning, has the potential of providing students with the opportunity of reflecting upon their language learning and working out problems in lexicon and structure as well as in organization and voice, all within the context of their own, and not someone else's meaning. (Heilenman, 1991, p.283)"

Thus, Heilenman considers writing as an effective means of developing integrated language skills. This is akin to the view of L2 writing proposed by some other researchers such as Cumming (1990) and Swain and Lapkin (1995): Writing enhances cognitive and metalinguistic awareness by allowing L2 writers to think in and reflect on the target language, which is conducive to L2 learning.

In sum, in FL instruction, writing has received "the most cursory attention" among the so-called four language skills, i.e., speaking, listening, reading, writing. Although new writing
pedagogies, emphasizing process writing with associated activities, have been seriously taken up in L1 and ESL (and immersion) programs. FL programs in North America have remained relatively unaffected by them. This can be attributed to the various situational constraints, itemized above, under which FL educators operate. However, there has been a shift in focus from the view of writing as writing-down-correctly to that of “writing through composing”.

2.1.2. Research on FL Writing

Corresponding to the minor role assigned to writing in FL pedagogy in North America, research on FL writing is still at an embryonic stage, as compared with research on ESL and EFL writing conducted outside English-speaking countries. There have been few empirical studies reported in published articles that examine the development of writing in a FL by North American students, reflecting the emphasis that is currently placed on spoken proficiency in FL programs (Herzog, 1988; Valdes et al., 1992). In comparison with nearly 3500 references listed in the annotated bibliography of ESL/EFL writing (Tannacito, 1995), the body of literature about FL writing is still small, despite an increase in the number of published works in the 1990s (Reichelt, 1999). In terms of theoretical perspectives adopted, FL writing research has not seriously taken up the sociocognitive perspective of writing (e.g., Flower, 1990; Langer, 1987), which has been integrated into theories of L1 and ESL writing. Clearly, both the amount and the scope of research on FL writing need to be expanded for a number of reasons. Writing research is necessary to build the FL knowledge base so as to enhance our understandings of various issues concerning FL writing in general and to “forge its own identity by delineating its own research agenda and pedagogical practices” (Reichelt, p. 193). In so doing, it can contribute to the development of a more comprehensive and inclusive theory of L2 writing, going beyond the current focus on ESL/EFL writing within the field of L2 writing research (see Leki, 2000).

Moreover, within the existing literature on FL writing, most research has focused on speakers of English learning Indo-European languages (e.g., Henry, 1996; Kepner, 1991; Lantolf, 1988; New, 1999; Whalen & Menard, 1995). Only a handful of studies has

---

7 There is a substantial body of research on ESL writing; see Cumming’s (1998) review for a concise discussion of theoretical perspectives on L2 writing. For recent examples of EFL writing research, refer to Gosden (1996), Hirose and Sasaki (1994), Pennington et al. (1996), Robb et al., (1986), and Tsang (1996).

8 Reichelt (1999), in her comprehensive review of published works concerning FL writing for the past three decades, reports that: (a) 233 sources could be located; (b) of these, 93 were works of research and the remaining 140 were discussions of pedagogy; and (c) the most common format for research-oriented works (48 out of 93) was dissertations, few of which were ever published elsewhere in another format.
investigated the learning of less commonly taught languages such as Japanese, a language very different from European languages in terms of its script and its agglutinative lexis and morphology (see Koda, 1993; Pennington & So, 1993; So, 1997; Uzawa & Cumming, 1989). The results of surveys and studies of Japanese language education confirms the impact of language distance on FL learning in that JFL students in North America indeed perceive learning of the Japanese language as difficult and anxiety-provoking because of its "truly foreign" nature (Jorden & Walton, 1987; Saito & Samimy, 19%; Samimy & Tabuse, 1992).9

In terms of methodology for investigating L2 literacy in general, Cumming (1994, p. 9) has stated that "systematic, empirical research on classroom learning and curricular processes in biliteracy education remains remarkably sparse, despite a burgeoning pedagogical literature advising educators how to organize reading and writing instruction in second languages". This applies to FL writing research in general, and in particular to research on writing conducted through systematic classroom inquiries, which has not been reported in any published articles on JFL research, according to the results of my bibliographic search of the data base, including the Modern Language Association and the Educational Resources Information Center index (February, 2000). Thus, there is clearly a strong need for studies addressing the contexts of FL writing and for classroom-oriented research on L2 writing in general.

2.1.3. Implications for This Study

In concluding this section on theory and practice in FL writing, I draw attention to the findings of my review of the relevant literature that are important for the current study:

- The view of FL writing has begun to shift from the traditional concept of 'writing-down correctly' to 'writing through composing';
- Writing has the potential of providing FL students with the opportunity of reflecting upon their language learning and working out problems in lexicon and structure as well as content, rhetorical effectiveness, and voice, when they are given the opportunity to express their own thoughts;
- Research on FL writing concerning North American students learning a FL is still an emerging field of investigation, and research on less commonly taught languages, such as Japanese in particular, is sparse;

---

9Two representative surveys on Japanese language education were conducted by the Modern Language Association of America (1991) and by the National Foreign Language Center (Jorden & Lambert, 1991). Although the explanation often cited for the high attrition rate is the "truly foreign" nature of the language (Jorden & Walton, 1987), this premise does not necessarily hold true with many students studying Japanese at the Canadian university where my research was conducted. A large number of Chinese immigrant and visa students, who predominantly specialize in economics or commerce, opt to take Japanese probably because of its economic potential and its orthographic similarities with Chinese. Therefore, the issue of language distance among JFL learners at my research site is not as clear-cut as Jorden and Walton suggest. Similar circumstances seemed to obtain in Uzawa and Cumming's (1989) study, also conducted in Canada.
Empirical research on classroom learning and curricular processes in L2 literacy studies is sparse.

Taken together, these findings point to the need for contextualized, classroom-oriented investigations of writing practices in various FL settings, where the 'writing through composing' perspective is practiced, such that students are encouraged to use their own writing to learn the target language meaningfully, reflect on their language use, and work on composing concerns such as content and rhetorical effectiveness. Therefore, the current study attempts to act on these implications so as to understand classroom learning and the curricular processes of FL writing practices in a context of less commonly taught languages through the use of a specific pedagogical technique (writing conferences) usually associated with the process writing approach.

2.2. Research on Revision and Teacher Feedback

The next two sections review the research focusing on revision, teacher feedback, and the effect of teacher feedback on students’ subsequent writing. First, I sketch out a number of views of revision that vary according to the models of writing adopted. Following that, I examine two forms of teacher feedback, namely written comments and conferences, as well as students’ revision practices and their perceptions of teacher feedback. Finally, I present a perspective offered by the situated view of literacy that underpins this study and conclude with the specific implications drawn from these sections for the current study.

2.2.1. Perspectives on Revision

Perspectives on revision have shifted in response to emerging models of writing: (a) the revision-as-final-stage editing model; (b) the problem solving model of revision; and (c) the social-interactive model of revision (Fitzgerald, 1992). The predominant view of writing before the 1980s was that of a linear stage model, comprising prewriting, writing, and post writing (Britton et al., 1975). In this model, revision was viewed as final-stage polishing at the levels of word and sentence. However, in the 1970s and 1980s, views of writing began to shift toward the inner cognitive processes involved in the activity of writing. A number of investigators had found evidence inconsistent with the linear model of writing and discredited it. Instead, they proposed a dynamic hierarchical cognitive theory of writing, involving planning, transcribing, and reviewing (Flower & Hayes, 1981) in which revision and its contributory role in the overall activity were reconceptualized (Hayes & Flower, 1983). In place of a view of revision as
making minor editorial changes, a new perspective emerged; revision was conceived to encompass both process and product. Fitzgerald (1987) summarized this view of revision as follows:

Revision means making any changes at any point in the writing process. It involves identifying discrepancies between intended and instantiated text, deciding what could or should be changed in the text and how to make desired changes, and operating, that is, making the desired changes. Changes may or may not affect the meaning of the text, and they may be major or minor. Also, changes may be made in the writer's mind before being instantiated in written text, at the time text is first written, and/or after text is first written. (p. 484)

More recently, revision has come to be viewed as a social-interactive process. For instance, Nystrand (1989) proposed the social-interactive model that homes in more on the knowledge constructed between and among the reader's and writer's minds. Nystrand and Brandt (1989) put forward the following model of revision:

Writers, as they compose, continually and appropriately elaborate elements of genre, topic, and commentary. Readers likewise monitor the text in terms of these three levels as part of successful comprehension. Communication occurs when a writer's elaborations mesh with a reader's expectations. (p. 219)

To summarize, I refer back to Fitzgerald's (1992, p.42) succinct explication of these three models of writing and resulting views of revision. First, the revision-as-final-stage-editing model focused on the text itself and targeted "knowledge that writers need about universal text attributes"; in this model, revision involves editing and polishing at the local levels. Second, the problem-solving model of revision focuses "on the world of the writer within the universe" and highlights "procedural knowledge and skill and ability to negotiate the universe"; in this model, revision involves both process and product. Finally, the social-interactive model " zeroes in on the linkages between readers and writers" and focuses more on the constructive nature of knowledge creation; revision in this model results from the interaction between a writer and a reader. Although Fitzgerald's observations are well informed, we also need to include a more contextualized perspective on writing (and by extension on revision) that is based on a situated view of learning. Although the present thesis study builds on the views that regard revision as encompassing both process and product and as a social-interactive process, it adopts the social constructivist view of writing, which takes account of the larger sociocultural milieu in which writing occurs. This perspective will be discussed later in a separate section.

---

10 It should be noted that some researchers used the term "revision" for the textual changes, themselves, preferring to separate revision process and product. For example, to refer to the mental aspects of revision, Scardamalia and Bereiter (1986) used the term "reprocessing", and Hayes and Flower (1983) used the term "reviewing". Yet, other investigators (Bridwell, 1980; Sommers, 1980) appear to include both the mental process and the actual changes made in the text when they use the term "revision".
2.3. Teacher Feedback on Students' Writing

In the teaching of writing, responding to student writing is one of the most contentious issues, both in theory and practice. What underlies this pedagogical practice is the conventional wisdom that student writing will improve “in direct proportion to the amount of time teachers spend on their papers” (Hairston, 1986). This wisdom has been subjected to much empirical investigation. As Leki (1990) put it, one of the pressing issues surrounding written responses is “whether or not written responses to student writing do any good” (p. 60). In this section, I review two forms of teacher feedback, written and oral.

2.3.1. Teacher Written Feedback

Earlier L1 and L2 studies on teacher written feedback to student writing unanimously suggested that teacher comments are ineffective in facilitating students’ subsequent revisions, since they are often confusing, unsystematic, vague and/or too narrowly focused on surface-level errors (e.g., Knoblauch & Brannon, 1981; Leki, 1991; Sommers, 1982; Zamel, 1985). For instance, Hillocks (1986) concluded that “teacher comment has little impact on student writing” (p. 165). These researchers also advised teachers to avoid mixing attention to content and form on preliminary drafts of students’ papers.

However, recent studies, both in L1 and L2, have reported more positive results. In the L1 context, university students have been shown to value teacher feedback and to use it to guide their revisions, albeit selectively (Beason, 1993), and it has been demonstrated that secondary and university students tend to improve their drafts in response to direct instruction that prompts them to use certain revision strategies (e.g., Bernhardt, 1988; Hawisher, 1987; Wallace & Hayes, 1991). Similarly, some ESL students consistently pay attention to teacher feedback, which helps them to make substantive and effective revisions, despite their occasional ignoring or avoiding of teacher suggestions (Ferris, 1997). Though reporting similar findings, Conrad and Goldstein (1999) noted that “the crucial variable that influenced the effectiveness of revisions was the type of problem students were asked to revise” rather than characteristics of the teachers’ comments (p.160).

A related pedagogical issue in teacher response is where the focus of such feedback should be: content versus form. To date, results of L2 investigations remain inconclusive. Some researchers have indicated that, despite teacher’s attention to errors in their written feedback to
students’ writing, these errors persist (Robb et al., 1986; Semke, 1984; Truscott, 1996). On the other hand, based on the results of their experimental study, Fathman and Whalley (1990) argued that, when grammar and content feedback are provided simultaneously, the content of revised texts improves approximately as much as when students receive content feedback alone. Nevertheless, Kepner’s (1991) study of college-level Spanish students found that consistent provision of “message-related comments” promoted the development of L2 writing competency with respect to “ideational quality and surface-level accuracy” (p. 310).

2.3.2. Revision As It Is Practiced

To complicate the picture presented above, it has been pointed out that students have a limited conception of revision and tend to focus on surface-level changes (e.g., Cohen, 1987; Fitzgerald, 1987). Additionally, research has shown that while more skilled and proficient writers revise and rewrite extensively (e.g., Bridwell, 1980; Monohan, 1984; Zamel, 1983), less skilled writers have a proclivity to attend more to surface features than more skilled writers do (e.g., Faigley & Witte, 1981; Raimes, 1985; Zamel, 1983). In a different vein, Hall (1990) showed that advanced ESL skilled writers successfully transferred their revision processes across their L1 and L2. Nonetheless, there were more revisions in L2 to the extent that recursiveness “took on an additional function in the second language as the writers grappled with the semantics of words and the structures of sentences” (p. 56). Based on his findings, Hall suggested that teachers should help L2 students individualize their revision processes rather than give prescriptive advice for revision, since “the ability to revise develops and improves when ESL writers confront problems in their own writing” (p. 57). Evidently, we need to consider teacher feedback in conjunction with the characteristics and purposes of the students under investigation.

2.3.3. L2 Students’ Perceptions of Teacher Feedback

Accordingly, recent empirical studies have begun to examine L2 writers’ perceptions and preferences for expert feedback (e.g., Ferris, 1995; Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988).

---

11Truscott (1996) goes so far as to suggest completely eliminating grammar correction in L2 writing classes. For well-founded counter-arguments, see Ferris (1999) and Lyster, Lightbown, and Spada (1999). For discussions of fossilization, see Selinker (1972) and Ellis (1994).

12Fitzgerald (1987), in her extensive review of research on text revision in L1, concluded that writers at various stages and various levels of competence mainly make surface and mechanical changes, revealing a view of revision as proofreading (p. 492).
Ferris' recent investigation concluded that "students both attend to and appreciate their teachers' pointing out their grammar problems" (1995, p. 48), confirming the findings of earlier studies. Further, Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) reported that ESL and FL learners showed a difference in their preferences for teacher feedback: In revising initial drafts, ESL writers were more concerned with rhetorical text features, but FL writers appreciated more grammatically and mechanically oriented feedback; however, in revising final drafts, this orientation was reversed. Moreover, ESL learners varied greatly in their response to feedback, suggesting a wide range of individual variation.

2.3.4. Research on Writing Conferences

In contrast to teacher feedback being given in writing, feedback can take a more interactive form. Conferences, in which writers are able to discuss their developing texts with their teacher, are conceived to provide an optimal setting in which writing strategies (e.g., critical reflection on the written text and revision) may be made overt, and so available for appropriation in students' zones of proximal development. Thus, conferences have come to be considered an effective form of writing instruction, as they capitalize on an intense one-to-one interaction (e.g., Freedman, 1987; Graves, 1983; Murray, 1979). The underlying assumption is that conference talk about a student's text should function as a "thinking device" for students (Lotman, 1988). Some of the early studies examined participants' attitudes toward conferencing and endorsed the writing conference as an effective pedagogical tool (Carnicelli, 1980; Sokmen, 1988; Zamel, 1985).

However, much of the research on L1 writing conferences has reported that the promise of conferencing does not translate neatly into practice. Researchers have found that teachers tend to dominate the interaction (e.g., Jacob & Kalimer, 1977; Walker & Elias, 1987), overemphasize low-level concerns such as mechanics at the expense of more important issues (e.g., Freedman, 1987; Freedman & Sperling, 1985), adopt an overtly authoritative role (Wong, 1988); and transfer the teacher-centered form of classroom discourse (i.e., initiate-respond-evaluate sequence) into the one-on-one instruction (e.g., Ulrichny & Watson-Gegeo, 1989).\footnote{Regarding the I-R-E sequence, that is to say, teacher initiates-student responds-teacher evaluates pattern, see Sinclair and Coulthard (1975).}

Notwithstanding these findings, as Harris and Silva (1993) note, one-to-one instruction...
has the potential of addressing L2 students' particular needs (also see Silva, 1990):

We should recognize that along with different linguistic backgrounds, ESL students have a diversity of concerns that can only be dealt with in the one-to-one setting where the focus of attention is on that particular student and his or her questions, concerns, cultural presuppositions, writing processes, language learning experiences, and conception of what writing in English is all about. (Harris & Silva, 1993, P.525)

This statement is equally applicable to various other L2 settings involving learning of a language other than English.

2.3.5. Redefining the Writing Conference

The findings described above point to a need for change in the teaching-learning process itself in order for conferences to be more productive. As noted in Cumming and So (1996), the extent to which tutors solicit students' input to the discourse differs from individual to individual, which suggests that the participation framework (Goffman, 1974) in tutoring and conferencing is socially constructed by participants. Similarly, Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) argued that, key to students' L2 development, is the pitching of the tutor's instruction in students' zones of proximal development, pointing out that L2 development is mediated through joint negotiation between the teacher and the student and "cannot be determined independently of individual learners interacting with other individuals" (p. 480). Likewise, in the L1 context, researchers such as Greenleaf and Freedman (1993) and Freedman (1987) argued that response practices including conferences should be a process of "collaborative problem solving". How one transforms a conference into collaborative problem solving is a subject of debate. At a macro-level, the overarching objective of conferencing is to promote students' development as writers in a personalized manner; the setting of the agenda for revision in a conference should ideally be negotiated between the teacher and the student. At a micro-level, an identification of problems and their solutions should be carried out with an appropriate degree of collaboration, to be determined by teacher and students together. Conceived in this way, conferences may become a setting for goal-oriented collaborative problem solving.

Leontiev (1981) explained the procedural aspect of a goal-oriented activity:

..apart from its intentional aspect (what must be done), the action has its operational aspect (how it can be done), which is defined not by the goal itself, but by the objective circumstances under which it is carried out. In other words, the performed action is in response to a task. The task is the goal given under certain conditions. Therefore, the action has special qualities, its own special "components", especially the means by which it is carried out, its operations. (p. 63)

Although the goals of 'action' may be set in advance, there are different ways in which the
goals are operationalized. In the case of conferences seen as ‘action’, inherent variables, such as the nature of the talk and how participants construe it, influence how they approach a particular task; this, in turn, creates different modes of interaction in carrying out the task. Sperling’s (1991) observation brings one back to conference talk:

And different students, who bring apparently differing linguistic facility to their conversations with their teacher, differing goals for interacting with the teacher, differing concepts of what it means to “do school,” and differing writing skills to master, will talk differently to their teacher about writing. (p. 2)

Therefore, in order to gain grounded insights into the ways in which conference talk contributes (or fails to contribute) to writing development for particular students in various classrooms, researchers need to take account of “the teacher’s and students’ classroom goals, their objectives for a particular assignment, and student ability” (Sperling, 1994, p. 208) among other factors.

In some writing conference research, including a series of studies by Sperling, broader observational methodologies have been used, in which contextual factors have been integrated with discourse analysis of the conference talk (e.g., Michaels, 1987; Ulichny & Watson-Gegeo, 1989). Common to these studies is an emphasis on the role of the immediate context. However, these studies did not take account of the larger context in which writing takes place: that is, the context of the individual as a whole person (how writing fits into the individual’s ontogenetic development), and the context of the social practices in which writing is embedded (how writing fits in cultural life). As this issue is related to the perspective offered by situated literacy, I will discuss it further in Section 2.4.

2.3.6. Research on the Link Between Conferencing and Text Revision

Few studies of revision, however, have attempted to link teacher feedback with revision by attending closely to the processes and products of revision, particularly in the context of writing conferences. “Given the complex and often ineffable nature of human behavior”, it is difficult to prove the link between conference discourse and students’ subsequent revisions in a definitive way (Sperling, 1994, p. 206).

Nonetheless, three studies have investigated this link. These studies identified qualitative and quantitative differences between L1 high and low achievers (Jacob & Karliner, 1977) and among ESL students from different cultural backgrounds and ability levels (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990). Differences were found in the nature of the conferences and in the students’ corresponding revisions. Comparing two L1 university students, Jacob and Karliner found that
the student who engaged in exploratory talk and initiated more discussion showed a deeper
analysis of the subject, whereas the student who, in deference to authority, allowed the teacher to
dominate the talk made more surface-level revisions without resolving the problems in content.
Thus, results pointed to the link between the type of oral interaction in conference and the type
of revisions made. In a similar vein, Goldstein and Conrad showed that, when revisions were
negotiated (or discussed meaningfully) in the conference, they tended to lead to successful
revisions. However, noting cultural and linguistic diversity among ESL students, they pointed
out the need to take these contextual factors into consideration and to understand “how
discourse is jointly built by the participants, and what characteristics of the discourse influence
‘success’, defined as either improvement in subsequent revisions or in terms of more positive
student attitude” (p.459).

Patthey-Chavez and Ferris’ (1997) recent study, conducted in a university setting,
examined whether the ‘status’ of the student (weaker or stronger, native or non-native speaker)
or the type of writing course (general, genre specific) could be tied to any systematic differences
in the conferencing process or its outcomes. Like Jacob and Karliner, they found quantitative
and qualitative differences in the conferences and subsequent revisions of high- and low
achieving students, though all students showed progress in response to conference discussion.
They also noted that the teacher’s focus in conferencing was influenced by the institutional
setting, i.e., the types of course and their different goals in view. Based on these findings, they
suggested, “the divergent backgrounds students bring to instructional events have a structuring
effect that cannot be dismissed solely as teacher bias and self-fulfilling prophecy” (p. 51).

However, the participants of these studies were either L1 students or advanced ESL
students at American universities. The fact that, by comparison, a larger proportion of FL
students do not attain advanced FL proficiency points to the need for research into teacher
feedback and text revision in writing conferences. As Heilenman (1991) reminds us, one
cannot assume that findings in L1 and ESL writing research apply to FL settings, so we need to
carry out empirical investigations in particular FL settings.

2.3.7. Implications for This Study

In concluding this section on revision and teacher feedback, the specific implications
that are important for the current study are:

1. Views of revision have changed over the last three decades: from (a) minor editorial
changes, (b) any changes made at any point in the writing process, to (c) changes made
as a result of transaction between reader and writer;

2. Contrary to the claims made by earlier studies about the ineffectiveness of teacher
feedback in facilitating students' text revision, recent studies both in L1 and L2 have shown that students value and attend to teacher feedback. However, there is a wide range of individual variation in L2 students' responses to feedback;

3. While skilled and more proficient writers revise consistently and extensively, less skilled writers tend to focus on surface features. Revising in L2 is cognitively demanding, as writers grapple with the semantics and morpho-syntax of L2. This is the case even for skilled, advanced ESL writers, notwithstanding their ability to use a single system of revision processes across two languages;

4. The ability to revise in L2 can be nurtured effectively under certain conditions, including individualized instruction to address L2 learners' specific needs and the use of their own written texts as a basis for reflecting on their language use and ideational and rhetorical concerns;

5. Contrary to the popular belief about the effectiveness of writing conferences, L1 research on conferences has painted a somewhat negative picture of actual practices. The texture of conferences depends on how participants interactionally constitute the flow of knowledge in the event, on who they are, and on many other situational factors. Accordingly, some researchers have called for a reconceptualization of conferencing as goal-oriented collaborative problem-solving activity; and

6. Within research on conferences, few studies have systematically investigated the link between the conference discourse and text revision, with the exception of three studies concerning L1 and advanced ESL students in a university setting. These studies showed that: (a) low- and high-achieving students engage in the talk very differently and the differences in their modes of participation are reflected in their revisions; (b) revisions that are meaningfully discussed in the conference lead to successful revision; (c) the institutional setting, students' backgrounds, and other contextual factors influence both the verbal interaction and text revision. Research on conferences in any FL setting has been sparse, even more so the link between talk and text.

In this study, I have adopted a view of revision as process and product and as transaction between reader and writer. I regard the conference as a goal-oriented collaborative problem-solving activity that is socially constructed by particular teachers and students in their moment-by-moment interactions. As well, I consider that it is important to individualize revision processes so as to address FL students' specific needs and to help them ultimately achieve the ability to revise their texts independently. The basis for such scaffolding activity should be students' own written texts and their agentive engagement with the texts.

Finally, taken together, the implications delineated above point to the need for an investigation of the following issues in a FL setting: (a) how FL writers with varied proficiency in the target language compose their drafts, perceive and use conferences, and revise their texts; (b) how FL writers, whose target language proficiency tends to be much lower compared with that of advanced ESL students, manage the complex activities of writing and revising, given that they lack mastery of basic aspects of language processing in the target language; (c) how conferences, conceived as a type of goal-oriented collaborative activity, play out in a FL classroom; (d) what factors make conferences open or closed for negotiation; (e) how the links
between conference discourse and text revision can be traced and meaningfully interpreted in a FL setting; and (f) the nature of FL writers’ revisions and the factors that affect their revising behavior.

2.4. *The Perspective of Situated Literacy*

As mentioned earlier, more socially oriented perspectives on literacy have emerged in recent years as a result of a number of strands of research (e.g., Bloom & Green, 1992; Cope & Kalantzis, 1993; Gutierrez, 1992, 1993; Heath, 1983; Langer, 1987; Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000; Street, 1984, 1993; Witte, 1992) that have shown the inadequacy of the cognitive model of the autonomous reader/writer (e.g., Goody & Watt, 1968; Olson, 1977). The basis for this sense of inadequacy is summarized by Williams and Hasan (1996) in their assertion that any literacy event in social life is “necessarily one which implicates readers, writers and texts understood as language in use in social contexts” and that texts are socially situated acts of semiosis and readers/writers are socially situated subjects (p. xi). Common to the positions taken by all the researchers referred to above is the recognition of the socioculturally constructed nature of literacy.

A critical contribution to this perspective was made by the work of Scribner and Cole (1981), who investigated the effects of literacy among the Vai people of Liberia, where the Vai writing system, not mastered through schooling, is of particular relevance. They found that nonliterate performed as well as or better than literate on a variety of cognitive and metalinguistic tasks; while level of performance on the cognitive tasks was associated with length of formal schooling, it was not associated with literacy in the Vai script, which is used most commonly for letters between relatives and business associates. However, those who were literate in the Vai script without schooling did better than non-literate when the tasks (such as explaining a new type of board game) required skills more closely related to those involved in the activities for which the Vai script is usually used. Moreover, in comparing Vai, Arabic, and English literacy coexisting in Liberia, they noted that some cognitive skills were enhanced by practices involving specific scripts. Subsequently, Scribner and Cole interpreted these results as evidence against the assumption that literacy amplifies generalized, higher-order intellectual skills. Instead, they argued that the intellectual skills that are facilitated are restricted to those that are closely associated with the uses to which reading and writing are put, such as the practices in which the Vai script serves practical but limited functions. Thus, while individual cognitive development is socially mediated, the links between literacy and individual cognitive development are strongly influenced by the types of function and the frequencies of use of written text in particular sociocultural contexts.
This shift toward a situated view of literacy in educational research is also reflected in L2 writing research. The importance of a socially contextualized understanding of writing practices has been increasingly recognized (e.g., Parks & Maguire, 1999; Prior, 1991, 1995; Silva, Leki, & Carson, 1997; Spack, 1996). To give one example, in her longitudinal study of one Japanese ESL student's development of academic literacy, Spack (1996) described major changes in the student's knowledge base, a transfer of skills across domains, and new orientations to literacy practices; portraying the student as the constructor of her own knowledge through interaction with members of the literate culture and their texts. Spack showed that literacy development is imbued with personal meanings. To put these studies in perspective, it is expedient to refer to Cumming's (1998) review of research on L2 writing. According to Cumming, although the threefold distinction writing researchers make between the text analytic, the composing process, and the constructivist views of writing is useful, two further issues need to be addressed, when writing is viewed from the perspective of L2 education (pp. 61). First, writing in a L2 occurs within particular situations of biliteracy that vary along several dimensions, such as individual's personal histories with, and proficiency in, the L1 and L2s, the use of multiple languages in different media and with differing status within a society, and the degrees of difference or similarity between certain languages. Second, to develop theoretical understanding of L2 writing that is relevant to education "requires attention to what particular teachers and students do, think, and accomplish in and through writing in relation to the setting in which they live" (Cumming, 1998, p.62).

2.4.1. Implications for This Study

In agreement with these new perspectives, I adopt a situated, social constructivist view of literacy. I consider that the way language is used and the kinds of cognitive skills developed are related to social practices encompassing the uses of literacy, and that literacy is not merely the acquisition of decontextualized cognitive and linguistic skills but also the mastering of specific ways of thinking and knowing embedded in particular sociocultural practices and actions. My perspective on FL writing and revising and the way I conceptualize the contexts that shape and are shaped by writing practices are influenced by previous research cited in this chapter. Table 2.1 presents a summary of implications for this study:
Table 2.1. Implications of a situated, social constructivist view of literacy for this study

| Perspectives on FL writing & revision                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. FL writing as text and composing                                                                     | writing is first and foremost composing, which results in a text object, or an improvable object on which writers can reflect and work |
| 2. writing as a tool for L2/FL learning                                                                    | writing enhances cognitive and metalinguistic awareness by allowing L2 writers to learn to think in and reflect on the target language, which is conducive to L2 learning |
| 3. FL writers viewed as agentic                                                                            | L2 writers are constructors of their own knowledge. As such, the ability to revise is developed when writers reflect and act on problems in their own texts. |
| 4. FL writing as engagement in social and cultural practices                                                | literacy (and by extension writing and revision) involves sociocultural practices and actions situated in particular settings, involving socially situated acts of semiosis; therefore, the various dimensions involved in a ‘literacy event’, or writing activity, have impact on the shaping of particular writing practices. |

Multiple contexts involved in FL writing activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Context Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sociocultural context of the situation</td>
<td>local circumstances, the role and link of writing practices in the classroom to institutional contexts and students’ lives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Curricular context</td>
<td>who the participants (teacher &amp; students) are, how they view literacy, what has been done, being done, and will be done in classroom instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interpersonal context</td>
<td>the face-to-face interactions people have with one another and with the text during the literacy activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intrapersonal context</td>
<td>the knowledge, experiences, expectations, and agendas individuals bring to the text and the literate activity; the nature of students’ biliteracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Context of individual learners’ trajectories</td>
<td>how FL writing fits in individual’s ontogenetic development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5. Action Research

Collaborative action research was selected as the most appropriate mode of inquiry for this research as it met my goal of enabling students to learn through active participation in the research. According to Carr and Kemmis (1983), action research aims at involvement and improvement in three areas:

...firstly, the improvement of a practice by its practitioners; secondly, the improvement of the understanding of the practice by its practitioners; and thirdly, the improvement of the situation in which practice takes place. The aim of involvement stands shoulder to shoulder with the aim of improvement. Those involved in the practice being considered are to be involved in the action research process in all its phases of planning, acting, observing and reflecting. (p. 165)

They also point out that, in terms of method, “a self-reflective spiral of cycles of planning acting, observing and reflection is central to action research” (pp. 162-63). Working within the framework of action research, the study aims to examine writing conferences in a naturalistic
classroom setting and to attempt to bring about a positive change in practice at the same time.

2.6. Perspective on Language Use and Conversation

The approach to the description of language use provided by systemic functional linguistics (SFL) is particularly relevant for the analysis of linguistic interaction, on which I drew on substantially in my analysis of the conference discourse. This section outlines a basic framework of SFL and its relevancy to the current study, focusing on its perspective on dialogue.

2.6.1. Systemic Functional Model of Language

The systemic functional linguistic approach to language explores both how people use language in different contexts and how language is structured for use as a semiotic system. It is therefore both a theory about language as social process and an analytical methodology that allows the systematic description of language patterns (Eggin & Slade, 1997). Within this theoretical perspective, language is seen as a resource for making meaning, that is to say, as a meaning potential (e.g., Halliday, 1978, 1994; Halliday & Hassan, 1985). As such, the process of language use is a process of making meanings by choosing. For instance, the same semantic intention can be diversely realized in lexico-grammar by making different choices from the linguistic system. Thus, what people actually say on a particular occasion is interpreted against the background of what could have been said or meant.

Within this theoretical framework, the linguistic system is viewed as consisting of three strata: semantics (the system of meanings), lexico-grammar (the system of wordings), and phonology/graphology (the system of sound and orthography). Semantics is realized by lexico-grammar, which in turn is realized by sounds and letters. Realization is “a relation that orders whole subsystems of language relative to one another in symbolic abstraction” (Matthiessen & Halliday, 1997, p. 37).

Language is a resource for making not just one meaning at a time but several types of meanings simultaneously. Three strands of meaning are distinguished: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. These are referred to as metafunctions. They can be realized in linguistic units of all sizes, ranging from word to text. Interpreted in this way, conversation, that is to say, an extended semantic unit or text, is conceived of as the simultaneous exchange of three strands of meaning (Eggin & Slade, 1997). The ideational metafunction is a resource for construing our experience of the world (e.g., topics, subject matter) and the interpersonal metafunction provides resources for enacting social roles and relationships (e.g., status, sharedness between
interactants). The textual metafunction presents ideational and interpersonal meanings as a flow of information in the unfolding of text (e.g., foregrounding and salience; types of cohesion).

Conversation, or dialogue, according to Halliday, is a form of exchange of social meanings, thus a semiotic process involving the three strata of the linguistic system and the stratum of context. Context is a higher-level semiotic system in which language is embedded. The stratum of context consists of the context of culture and the context of situation whereby higher level cultural meanings are multimodally constituted:

...language is embedded in a context of culture or social system and any instantiation of language as text is embedded in its own context of situation. Context is an ecological matrix for both the general system of language and for particular texts. It is realized through language; and being realized through language means that it both creates and is created by language. This realizational relationship is organized according to the principle of functional diversification. Like language, context is functionally diversified into three general domains: field, tenor and mode (Matthiessen & Halliday, 1997, p. 39)

Halliday refers to this classification of context in terms of register. The three dimensions of register are field (activity or topic focus), tenor (the participants, their roles and statuses), and mode (the part that language plays in the event). Each of these dimensions is realized through patterns in the different metafunctions. Field tends to be realized by ideational meanings, tenor by interpersonal meanings, and mode by textual meanings. In this way, the tripartite structure of language is an encoding of the tripartite structure of the contexts of situation.

2.6.2. Halliday's Model of Dialogue

As noted earlier, in systemic theory, conversation, or dialogue, is interpreted as a form of exchange of social meanings, which is “an ongoing process of contextualized choice”. Halliday (1984, p.11) suggests that dialogue is “a process of exchange” involving two variables: (a) the nature of the commodity being exchanged, either goods-&-services or information; and (b) roles associated with exchange relations, either giving or demanding. The simultaneous cross-classification of these two variables defines the four basic speech functions, namely the four basic types of moves interactants can make to initiate or respond in a piece of dialogue (Eggins & Slade, 1997, p.180-181). These four elementary speech functions are presented in Table 2.2.

---

15 In the current data, the commodity exchanged was almost exclusively information.
Table 2.2. *The Four Basic Initiating Speech Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Role</th>
<th>Commodity Exchanged</th>
<th>Initiating Speech Functions</th>
<th>Responding Speech Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Goods-&amp;-Services</td>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Command</td>
<td>undertaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>statement</td>
<td>acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Halliday (1994, p. 69)

The interactive nature of dialogue is built on the premise that speech roles position both the speaker and the respondent:

When the speaker takes on a role of giving or demanding, by the same token he assigns a complementary role to the person he is addressing. If I am giving, you are called on to accept; if I am demanding, you are called on to give. (Halliday, 1984, p. 12)

Halliday’s notion of speech roles thus implies that every time speakers take on a role, they also assign the listener a complementary role and that the choice of responding moves is constrained by the nature of the preceding initiating move. He explains:

Even these elementary categories already involve complex notions: giving means ‘inviting to receive’, and demanding means ‘inviting to give’. The speaker is not only doing something himself; he is also requiring something of the listener. Typically, therefore, an ‘act’ of speaking is something that might more appropriately be called an ‘interact’; it is an exchange in which giving implies receiving and demanding implies giving in response. (1994, p.68)

These primary speech functions are matched by a set of desired responses: accepting an offer, carrying out a command, acknowledging a statement, and answering a question. In cases where an interactant produces a response other than the expected one, it is referred to as a discretionary alternative. Speech functions and responses are summarized in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3. *Speech Function Pairs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Role</th>
<th>Commodity Exchanged</th>
<th>Initiating Speech Functions</th>
<th>Responding Speech Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td>goods-&amp;-services</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>command</td>
<td>undertaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td>information</td>
<td>statement</td>
<td>acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>question</td>
<td>answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Halliday (1994, p.69) and Eggins & Slade (1997, p. 183)

Halliday’s account of dialogue sets up a hierarchy of three networks: (a) social-contextual; (b) semantic, and (c) lexico-grammatical. At the social-context level, “the dynamics
of dialogue consists in assigning, taking on and carrying out a variety of speech roles" (1984, p. 10) and the system network expresses “the potential that inheres in one move in the dynamics of personal interaction” (p. 12). This is at a level above the linguistic code, since the exchange can be realized through systems other than language (e.g., nodding in acknowledgement). The semantic level is the highest level in the linguistic system; it is “the network of semantic options by which the options in the exchange process are encoded as meanings in language” (p. 13). At the lexico-grammatical level, semantic options are realized through lexico-grammar. Within the framework of this three-level interpretation of dialogue:  
... the categories of speech function are both (I) realising the social-contextual options of role-assignment and commodity exchange and (ii) realised by the grammatical options of mood - as well as (iii) forming a coherent system in their right. (1984, p.13)

2.6.3. Structural-Functional Approach to Discourse

The approach to discourse analysis adopted in the current study is structural-functional in its orientation. Underlying it is the view of conversation as a highly organized level of language beyond that of lexico-grammar. It ask: What is conversational structure? and how is this structure related to the function that conversations serve? It draws on Halliday (1984)'s view of dialogue described in the previous section and incorporates insights from Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Berry (1981), Wells (1981, 1996), and Eggins and Slade (1997).

2.6.3.1. two dimensions of the organization of discourse. Discourse organization has perhaps been explored in most detail by Conversational Analysts, focusing particularly on turn-taking, in an effort to explicate the “routine grounds of everyday life” (Garfinkel, 1967). One of the insights offered by work with this orientation is ubiquity of the adjacency pair as the operating principle of turn-taking (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). In adjacency pairs, characterized by reciprocally related pairs of single-utterance turns, there is a strong expectation that following the first turn, the next utterance will be the second part of the appropriate pair. However, an examination of continuous discourse data makes it clear that more is involved in the organization of discourse.\(^\text{16}\) In order to understand the larger, macro structure of conversation, it is helpful to think of discourse as having two interrelated dimensions: syntagmatic and paradigmatic. The syntagmatic dimension refers to “the sequential chaining in

\(^{16}\)Conversational Analysis recognizes the more general principle underlying discourse organization, namely the “sequential relevance” or “sequential implicativeness of talk” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1974, p.296). Put simply, conversational turns make sense because they are interpreted in sequence. Although the adjacency pair is the prototypical variety of the principle of sequential relevance, reflexive tying of speech events is not limited to the adjacency pair but operates across considerable stretches of discourse (e.g., Goffman, 1974; Phillips, 1976). However, work in Conversational Analysis, has tended to focus more on micro-structural issues than on the macro-structure of conversation.
which one turn follows another”. On the other hand, the paradigmatic dimension refers to “the choice as to what is done at each link in the chain” (Wells 1981, p. 27).

Although the syntagmatic dimension provides a basic framework, the temporal sequencing of turns is managed in combination with choices made at each turn on the paradigmatic dimension. Conversations take place because participants have some interactional purposes to fulfil and it is the negotiation of these purposes that structures particular conversations within the turn-taking framework, thus, they are constructed by the interplay between the two dimensions. The organizing principle can be described in terms of “prospectiveness”, that is to say, the expectations set up in any move for the type of move that will immediately follow. Prospectiveness thus relates the paradigmatic to the syntagmatic dimension, and this allows participants to negotiate role-taking, jointly construct long sequences of speech, and achieve their personal goals with respect to ideational meanings (Wells, 1981).

Halliday (1984) described two basic exchange-types: (a) Demand/Give-in-Response and (b) Give (unsolicited)/Accept. The combination of the first two results in a third equally basic type, Demand/Give-in-Response/Accept.17 When the commodity exchanged is information, this gives rise to the three-move structure: Question/Answer/Acknowledgement. It is commonly used in everyday conversation, as for example:

Table 2.4. The Relationship between the Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Dimensions of Discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Syntagmatic Dimension</th>
<th>Paradigmatic Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Initiate</td>
<td>Give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Could I borrow your bike, please?</td>
<td>Initiate</td>
<td>Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sure it's in the garage</td>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>Give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Thanks very much</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wells (1981, p.28)

Note. T = turn, S = speaker; speech functions that are selected are chosen from a pool of speech functions available to participants (e.g., request, offer, comply, question, answer, challenge, and so on).

As is illustrated in Table 2.4, prospectiveness is based on different degrees of expectation for a following response set up by the three main types of move. Exchanges ‘normally’ decrease in prospectiveness in successive moves: Demand> Give> Acknowledge. The three types of move can be conceived of as situated at different points on a scale of prospectiveness. At one end of the scale, demand moves are strongly prospective in their

---

17To avoid confusion with the ‘accept’ move function when evaluating a preceding student response, the term ‘acknowledge’ is used instead of ‘accept’ in the current study.
expectation of a response. Located at the other end, acknowledge moves have little or no prospective force. Give moves occupy an intermediate position.

However, at any point in the exchange after the nuclear initiation, the current speaker can initiate a bound exchange by raising the level of prospectiveness beyond that which is predicted, and in so doing set up an expectation for a further move. For instance, instead of an expected Give move in response, a respondent can raise prospectiveness by using a Demand move or a Give move that functions in some respects like a Demand move, hereafter described as Give+ move. This “raising” can be achieved in three ways. The first option is to use a tag (e.g., use of an affective particle such as ne in Japanese) or rising pitch movement, which results in a Give+ move. The second option is to minimally fulfill the requirement set up by the previous move and initiate a new exchange in the same turn. The third option, what has been called “pivoting” (Wells, 1981), involves an implicit realization of the expected move in a move that initiates a new exchange. The following examples in Table 2.5 illustrate these three options.

Table 2.5. Three Options to Raise the Level of Prospectiveness

| Option 1: the use of tag or rising pitch movement | Turn 1 | A: Jane | Initiate | Give | Call |
| 2 B: Yes | Respond | Ack | Available |
| 3 A: Where is your bike? | Initiate | Demand | Question |
| 4 B: It’s in the garage, isn’t it? | Respond | Ack | Ack |
| 5 A: OK | Respond | Give+ | Answer |

| Option 2: minimally fulfill the requirement set up by the previous move and initiate a new exchange in the same turn | Turn 1 | A: Jane | Initiate | Give | Call |
| 2 B: Yes | Respond | Ack | Available |
| 3 A: Could I borrow your bike, please? | Initiate | Demand | Request |
| 4 B: Sure | Respond | Give | Comply |
| Could you please be sure to bring it back by 3 o’clock? | Initiate | Demand | Request |
| 5 A: OK | Respond | Give | Ack |

| Option 3: pivoting involving an implicit realization of the expected move in a move that initiates a new exchange | Turn 1 | A: Jane | Initiate | Give | Call |
| 2 B: Yes | Respond | Ack | Available |
| 3 A: Could I borrow your bike, please? | Initiate | Demand | Request |
| 4 B: I have a doctor’s appointment at 4 o’clock | Implicit Res. | Give | Comply |
| | Initiate (Pivot) | Demand | Statement |
| 5 A: OK | Respond | Ack | Ack |
| I’ll make sure I bring it back by 3 | Initiate | Give | Promise |

Note. Ack = acknowledge; Implicit Res = implicitly respond to the preceding initiating move

2.6.4. Summary

The perspective on language use and discourse adopted in the current study is based on
systemic functional linguistics (SFL) (Halliday, 1978, 1994). Within this theoretical framework, language is considered in a social context as resources for communication and for making meaning, not as a set of formal rules. As the name SFL suggest, essential to this theory is an exploration of how people use language in different contexts (functional) and of how language is structured for use as a semiotic system (systemic). Every time language is used in no matter what situation, the user makes constant choices from the meaning potential. At the same time, these choices are realized through and within the structure of the linguistic system. The linguistic system is viewed as comprising three strata: semantics, lexico-grammar, and phonology/graphology. In addition, the linguistic system is embedded in context, which is a higher-level semiotic system. As Halliday notes, language is embedded in “a context of culture or social system and any instantiation of language as text is embedded in its own context of situation” (1984, p. 39). The context of situation is considered in terms of the three dimensions of register (field, tenor, mode). Register is a descriptive apparatus for linking the context of situation to the semantic potential of language. Register looks in two directions: on the one hand, to the relevant semiotic features of the situation; and on the other, to the metafunctions of the linguistic system. Each of the register dimensions is realized through the corresponding metafunction of the semantic stratum (ideational, interpersonal, textual respectively). That is to say, context is realized through language and “being realized through language means that it both creates and is created by language (Halliday, 1984, p. 39). Thus, SFL “theorizes the links between language and social life so that conversation can be approached as a way of doing social work” (Eggins & Slade, 1997, p.47).

Drawing on Halliday’s work (1984, 1994), the approach to discourse analysis adopted in the present study is structural-functional, treating discourse as a highly organized level of language beyond that of lexico-grammar. Two central questions in this approach are: What is conversational structure? and how is this structure related to the functions that conversations serve? As such, it is essential to examine the organization of discourse in terms of two interrelated dimensions and the interplay between the two: syntagmatic (the sequential structure or chain) and paradigmatic (the choice to be made at each link in the chain). The technical aspects of the coding scheme for the discourse analysis will be described in Chapter 3.
2.7. Additional Theoretical Perspective

The study reported in this thesis also drew upon another theoretical domain, cultural historical activity theory (CHAT). Together with SFL, CHAT influenced my understanding of the writing and conference activities investigated. In particular, my study was informed by Vygotsky's concept of 'learning and teaching in the zone of proximal development' (ZPD), that is to say, the claim that significant others, capable peers and adults, play a critical role in providing the guidance and assistance that enable the learner to become an increasingly autonomous participant in the activity in which s/he engages (Vygotsky, 1978). For a learner in any situation, there is a ZPD: the zone of potential learning that lies between what the learner can do unaided and what the learner can do with assistance. When instruction is pitched in this zone, it can maximally benefit the learner. Learning, therefore, leads development through assistance in the ZPD. Using this framework, I conceptualized the writing conference as a joint problem-solving activity in which assistance is given in the form of instruction that is finely tuned to the student’s ZPD. However, since CHAT is reviewed in Chapter 6, in relation to the data to which they apply, and used as a tool for discussing the findings of the current study, it will not be considered further here.

2.8. Statement of Purpose

As discussed in the previous sections, building on findings and implications of previous research, this study addressed an unexplored area of research in L2 writing. That is, it was a classroom inquiry in a FL setting that:

1. focused on a FL classroom where ‘writing through composing’ guides writing instruction;
2. was based on the view of writing summarized in Table 2.1, including the view of FL writers as agents of their own learning;
3. adopted the perspective of situated literacy with respect to writing;
4. took account of the multiple levels of context that shaped and were shaped by writing practices;

18Wells (1999) stresses the role that students are given in shaping the goals of activity, placing more emphasis on the significance of educational activities being meaningful to learners, and on negotiated curriculum in which students take an active part in curricular decisions. In this view, the ZPD is treated as interactional in nature and “an attribute, not of the student alone, but of the student in relation to the specifics of a particular activity setting”. It is also “created in the interaction between the student and the co-participants in an activity, including the available tools and the selected practices, and depends on the nature and quality of that interaction as much as on the upper limit of the learner’s capability” (p. 5).
5. examined writing conferences, conceptualized as collaborative problem-solving activity in FL students’ ZPD, and how the participation framework was socially constructed in the moment-by-moment interaction;

6. examined the link between the conference discourse and students’ subsequent text revisions;

7. explored how students whose linguistic and cultural backgrounds and target language proficiency varied considerably participated in instructional conversations with the teacher.

2.9. Research Questions

I posed three research questions in this study:

1. What factors influenced the content of the talk and the patterns of interaction in the teacher-student conferences?

2. How did the teacher-student conferences contribute to students’ subsequent revisions?
   A) What was the nature of the revisions made?
   B) What relationships could be observed between the discourse in conferences and students’ revisions in their subsequent drafts?

3. To what extent were the students’ modes of engagement with the writing activity explicable in terms of their differential proficiency in the target language?
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter documents the research methods used in the study. First, the overall research design is presented, followed by a description of the research site and participants, the type of research undertaken, and its classroom enactment. Second, in separate sections, each of the four types of data and the procedures of data collection are described. Then, the procedures and measures for analysis are presented. With respect to techniques and approaches to analysis, although some were predetermined at the outset of the research, others emerged in the light of my inspection of the data.

3.1 Overall Research Design

Nine students who were enrolled in a fourth-year JFL reading and writing course at a Canadian university participated in the research. The data collection took place over 13 weeks in the second half of the full-year course from January to the beginning of April in 1998, and the majority of data were collected in the context of regular class activities. Three writing conferences were carried out with each of the participating students on drafts of three writing tasks in expository writing.

First, each student was asked to set up their own revision goals. Then, the students were asked to write a Japanese composition of about 800-1000 characters in length on each of the three topics that they had selected collectively in the first semester, using the prompt provided. Teacher-student writing conferences were held for discussion of text revision on the basis of students' first drafts and in light of the students' goals. The students were then asked to revise their texts on their own, based on the conference discussion, and to submit their final versions the following week. Immediately after the submission of the final draft of each writing task, two sets of retrospective interviews were carried out with each participant; while the first interview concerned how they made specific changes from first to final drafts, the second one concerned such topics as their perceptions of the conference activity and of their revision and composition.

3.2 Research Site and Participants

The site of this study was a fourth-year JFL reading and writing course that I taught at a Canadian university during the academic year of 1997-98. The aim of the course was to help intermediate and advanced JFL learners to further develop their Japanese literacy skills. The class sessions were held once a week for two hours over two semesters, totalling 26 class

\[19\] I had to exclude one student since there was strong evidence for plagiarism in the written texts.
sessions and 52 instructional hours in one academic year. In each semester, the students studied three topics in a four-week instructional cycle.  

Being the most advanced JFL literacy skills course at the institution, the class usually includes students with a range of skills: those whose mastery of spoken Japanese is native-like (whose home language is Japanese or a mixed code between Japanese and English) to students who struggle to produce one coherent sentence. The diversity in students’ linguistic abilities poses a challenge in terms of instruction and assessment. The class of 1997-98 was no exception. In addition, nine participating students had diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds. Four were of Chinese origin, born and educated in Taiwan; Mandarin was their L1 (Clive, Cindy, Chris, and Craig). Two students were Anglo-Canadians with English as their L1 (Edward and Ewan). There was one Korean visa-student who had recently come to Canada to study (Keith). The remaining two were of Japanese ancestry who were born to Japanese-speaking families (Jim and June). Whereas June listed Japanese as her L1, Jim listed English as his L1 since English had been his “primary language” (Stern, 1983). A more comprehensive profile of the nine students is reported in Chapter 4. 

In sum, this class consisted of a small group of variously motivated university JFL learners with a wide range of linguistic skills in the target language, ethnolinguistic background, and goals for JFL learning. A challenge in this multilevel FL class was to create learning opportunities in various participatory configurations so that the students’ different linguistic needs were met.

3.3. Classroom Enactment

In keeping with the action research orientation, I aimed at involvement and improvement in the three areas that Carr and Kemmis (1983) delineate. In terms of improvement, I decided to address a pedagogical challenge that this class inherently posed: meeting divergent linguistic needs of the students in a very limited instructional time. In order to individualize instruction so as to ‘scaffold’ each student more effectively, I selected writing conferences as a means of

---

20The majority of the nine participants had taken courses with me in the previous years, and they were also concurrently enrolled in my other JFL course focusing on speaking and listening. As a result, I had contact with them twice a week throughout the academic year.

21I have identified each student by a pseudonym beginning with the first letter of their spoken L1s.

22The two students that I identified as Japanese speakers had very different profiles. June came to North America when she was 14 and completed high school here, having been educated in Germany (grades 1, 2, 3) and in Japan (up to grade 8). She feels that her strongest language is Japanese. Jim, on the other hand, was born and raised in Canada by Japanese parents. He identifies himself as an English speaker, having gone through his formal education in the medium of English. For Jim, Japanese was a tool to communicate with his parents at home. In a recent visit to Japan for two months, his first trip to his parents’ homeland, he became aware that his Japanese needed improving since he encountered difficulty in being understood.
pedagogical intervention, since the writing conferences involve an intense one-on-one interaction between teacher and individual student. As the instructional time was rather limited, the students and I agreed that the conferences should be conducted outside of class.

As a way of increasing student involvement, I took a learner-centered approach to the curriculum (Nunan, 1988), encouraging them to take a more active role in the curriculum decision-making process and in establishing learning goals for their writing. As preparation, at the end of the first semester I asked the students to consider what they collectively wished to study in the following semester. They identified an overlapping interest in 'cross-cultural similarities and differences between Japan and Canada'. Having decided on a unifying theme, they proceeded to select three focal topics: the status of women, educational practices, and patterns of employment.

Once the topics were selected, I located relevant teaching resources, created various instructional activities tailored to each one of the student-selected topics, and took responsibility for organizing classroom activities. As was mentioned previously, four weeks were allocated for each topic. At the end of each four-week cycle, I asked students to write and revise one essay per topic, thus producing three first drafts and three final drafts. Prior to writing the essays, each student selected two goals for revision in consultation with me: the first was to be a micro-level goal (e.g., mechanics and grammar) and the second a macro-level goal (e.g., discourse organization and argumentation). Although it was I who suggested the overall structure of the course, it was the students who decided what topics to study, what aspects of writing they would like to improve, and what to focus on in writing conferences and in their text revisions.

The students engaged in a variety of instructional activities in each four-week cycle: (a) discussion of the reading materials with their peers and in whole class, including any clarification of linguistic problems; (b) learning of new vocabulary, using the vocabulary building sheets that I developed; (c) interviewing each other about their perspectives on the particular topic in class; (d) a class presentation on one of the three selected topics in a group of three; and (e) bi-weekly short in-class writing exercises focusing on macro-level issues (e.g., how to connect sentences and paragraphs in a rhetorically effective manner). In the last week of the four-week instructional cycle, I asked the students to compose and submit an essay in Japanese on the topic under study, using the writing prompt provided. Thus, the writing component (write-conference-revise) and other instructional activities were connected to each
other and interdependent.\textsuperscript{23}

At the beginning of the second semester and prior to asking for their collaborative participation, I explained to them how this research was informed, grounded in, and shaped by my experiences of teaching them in the first semester and of teaching JFL students for the past several years. I also mentioned that, through participation in this research, I hoped to provide an opportunity for them to grow as writers of Japanese prose. I described my research project, what I hoped to achieve in collaboration with them, and what would be entailed if they consented to take part in the research. I then invited them to participate in the research (see Appendix A for my letter of solicitation). A week later in the following class session, ten students out of eleven volunteered to participate in the research and signed the consent form. I excluded one student from the analysis, so findings pertaining to nine students are reported in this study. The participants' profiles are given at the beginning of the next chapter.

\textbf{3.4 Data Collection}

The three main sources of data I collected consisted of audio-recordings of writing conferences conducted with each of the participating students on the first drafts of three writing tasks; audio-recordings of three sets of retrospective interviews; and the students' written productions, including first and final drafts. In addition, in order to contextualize the main data, I also collected supplementary data, including a Profile Sheet (questionnaire) filled out by the students, their revision goal statements and evaluations of their goal attainments, and the ratings of their Japanese proficiency measured by the Japanese Speaking Test.

Since data collection involved multiple sources, each data type and the procedures of data collection are described in separate sections of this thesis. Figure 3.1 illustrates the relationship between the data sets and the analytical methods used (to be described in the subsequent sections).

\textsuperscript{23}There appeared to be an interplay between the writing-related activities and other classroom activities in the learning environment. For instance, I observed that some segments of the students' written texts reflected the assigned readings, class discussion, and what was presented in the oral reports, and the vocabulary building sheets that I had developed. However, I did not analyze how the other components of classroom instruction interacted with the writing-related activities.
3.4. Written Productions

As was mentioned, for each of the student-selected topics, there was a corresponding writing assignment. The students wrote an essay in Japanese on each topic, using the writing prompt provided for each task. The required length of each essay was around 800-1000 characters or about two pages of regular-sized writing paper. Since not all the participants had Japanese word processing software on their computers, I gave them pieces of *genkooyoohi*, a Japanese and Chinese standard form of manuscript paper containing 400 to 500 small squares into each of which one character fits, thus making it easy to tell how many characters were written without the help of the word count on the computer. However, the students were free to select the tools they used: handwriting on regular paper or in *genkooyoohi*, or using a computer. Three out of nine students opted for composing on the computer, using a Japanese word processing program.

An argumentative task was selected since it seemed most appropriate, given the objective of writing assignments stipulated in the course outline: “to provide an opportunity for students to think critically about the topic discussed in class, to develop their ideas about the topic, to express them coherently in Japanese, and to consolidate their linguistic knowledge in the process of writing”. The students wrote first and final drafts for the three tasks, thus producing 18 compositions per task and 54 compositions in total. Copies of all the compositions constitute the first set of data.

3.4.1.1. writing task. The first writing task, which was developed by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (1978), was what Cumming (1988) used in his doctoral dissertation as an argumentative task. The decision to use this task was based on two reasons: it had been field-tested and studied; and it fit the first topic of class. The prompt for the task was
phrased, "Some people believe that a woman's place is in the home. Others do not. Take one side of the issue. Write an essay in which you state your position and defend it". The second and third writing prompts used the same rhetorical function as the first prompt, although different topics were introduced. I provided the prompts both in the original English form and in Japanese translation. The three writing prompts were:

Topic #1:
Josei wa katei o mamorubeki da to kangaeru hito mo iru ga, soo dewa nai to iu hito mo iru. Ippoo no tachiba o totte, jibun no iken o nobenasai (Some people believe that a woman's place is in the home. Others do not. Take one side of the issue. Write an essay in which you state your position and defend it);

Topic #2:
Koogi wa mottomo kooritsu no yoi manabi kata to kangaeru hito mo iru ga, soo dewa nai to iu hito mo iru. Ippoo no tachiba o totte, jibun no iken o nobenasai (Some people believe that students learn most effectively by listening to lectures. Others do not. Take one side of the issue. Write an essay in which you state your position and defend it);

Topic #3:
Shu~rlzinkoyoo o shijr' suru hito rno iru ga, shoi shinai hito mo iru. Ippoo no tachiba o totte, jibun no iken o nobenasai (Some people believe that employment should be for a life time. Others do not. Take one side of the issue. Write an essay in which you state your position and defend it).

3.4.2. Conference Data
In the fourth week of each instructional cycle, the students were asked to submit an essay in Japanese on the topic that they had studied for the preceding three weeks, using the writing prompt provided. In the following week, immediately after the students submitted their first drafts, I held writing conferences individually with each student. About forty-five minutes were allotted for each conference. Conferences were conducted in my office, outside class hours. The conferences thus centered on the finished first drafts as compared with the short but frequent writing conferences in the classroom while students work on their writing that are typical of conferences in a school context. These JFL writing conferences were similar to those typically seen at an institution of higher education, where students seek tutorial help from the instructors with their essays in the writing center or laboratory outside of their class sessions.

Prior to each conference, the students were instructed to identify any passages, words, and other organizational problems that they would like to discuss with me in the light of the goals that they had selected. I strongly encouraged them to take an active part in the conference talk and to use Japanese during the conference with the provision that they could fall back on English if necessary. The students persisted in using Japanese as much as they could manage.
During each conference, when I judged that each student had reached the ceiling of his/her current abilities, I tried to help her or him with identification of what I considered to be undetected problems so that the students would be able to identify the areas that they needed to revise by themselves.24

All the conference sessions, a total of 27, were audio-recorded using two tape recorders. I transcribed all the tapes and put them in computer files for analysis. I initially transcribed the tapes phonetically in romanized script for time-efficiency and then retyped them into standard Japanese orthography for the ease of coding later. The transcripts of conference sessions constitute the second set of data.

3.4.3. Retrospective Interviews

Immediately following the submission of the final draft of each writing task, two sets of retrospective interviews were conducted with each of the participating students in order to address different aspects of conferencing and to incorporate the students' perspectives on their participation in conferencing. The three sets of two-part retrospective interviews were conducted in English. They were audio-recorded and later transcribed for analysis.

I conducted the first part of the interview regarding specific changes made in revising the text. Copies of the first and final drafts were shown to the students with changes made in the text highlighted in yellow marker. They were asked to explain why and how they had made each change as explicitly as they could. An external researcher (see below) conducted the second part of the interview, using a semi-structured interview format (Patton, 1990). He asked the students to describe their perceptions of the effectiveness of conferencing, their objective(s) (either pre-selected or negotiated) with respect to each conference session, the revision and composition strategies that they used for each task, and specific problems encountered in

---

24I did not control the students’ note-taking behaviors during the conference sessions. As a result, some students scribbled notes in the margins of their compositions, while others just focused on the on-going talk. This variation may have affected the results in the correspondence analysis between the conference talk and subsequent revisions.
revision with respect to each task.\textsuperscript{25}

The number of interview questions varied from task to task (eight for the first task, thirteen for the second task, and fourteen for the third task). The first eight questions used for the first interview, involving evaluation of the conference, were also used for each subsequent interview. However, after discussing how things went in the first round of interviews, David and I decided to add more questions to the subsequent ones, based on what emerged during the course of each interview. Whereas the focus of the first eight questions was on the specifics of a particular conference session, the additional questions were of a general nature, asking about such things as the students’ composing and revising strategies and their perceptions about writing in Japanese (Appendix B).

\textit{3.4.3.1. the external researcher.} An external researcher was solicited to conduct the second part of the interview, since it involved an evaluation of the conference, thus raising ethical concerns if I were to interview the students while I was teaching them. I looked for someone who was bilingual and biliterate in English and Japanese, expecting the interview sessions to involve both languages: English being the medium of communication and Japanese being used with reference to the written text. I also considered it important to select someone with first-hand experience of studying JFL in a university setting--someone who had a good understanding of what it was like to study JFL as an adult.

Accordingly, I asked one of my former students, who was completing his master’s degree on Japanese religion at the time of the data collection, to act as an external researcher. After having completed his one-year study at a Japanese university as an exchange student, David was fluent in spoken and written Japanese. He is a native-speaker of English and studied Japanese at the same university; he took the same fourth-year Japanese course with me in the academic year of 1993-94.

\textit{3.4.4. Supplementary Data}

Supplementary data were also collected to build a comprehensive personal profile of each student, to gain insight into what each student brought into the instructional setting, and to

\textsuperscript{25}Since the second half of the interview involved an evaluation of the conferences, I asked David to interview the students in order to preserve confidentiality. Notwithstanding my worries, it became apparent in the first interview sessions that the students were not interested in evaluation at all, which was evidenced in their brief answers to any of the evaluative questions posed. David and I discussed this matter and decided to add more non-evaluative questions that the students appeared to have been eager to elaborate on. As a result, the focus of the interviews primarily centred on such issues as their views of learning of the Japanese language, the process of composing and revising in Japanese, and their strategies to write in Japanese. In addition, I needed to attend to another ethical concern: my interviews with David about his talk with the students. In order to ensure confidentiality, I asked him to describe his impressions in general terms without naming any of the participating students. However, when I could clearly identify a particular individual, I asked him not to go on.
contextualize my interpretations of the main data. These supplementary data were used selectively as appropriate when I judged that they could help the interpretation of the main data.

Five types of supplementary data were collected. The first three types were generated by the students. First, a detailed questionnaire, Profile Sheet, was administered to gain information about each student in terms of such variables as their ethnolinguistic background and self-evaluation of their Japanese proficiency. Second, as a means of measuring the participants’ Japanese language proficiency, a tape-mediated test of spoken Japanese, the Japanese Speaking Test (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1992), was administered. Third, the participants’ statements of revision goals set up at the beginning of the study and their evaluation of goal attainment at the end of the study were also included (Appendix C).

The last two types of data were generated by the two researchers, David and myself. David, who was responsible for the second part of the retrospective interview, wrote field notes after each of the three interview sessions, describing his overall impressions of the interview and commenting on what was salient. I conducted three sets of semi-structured, open-ended interviews with David in order to get his immediate reactions to each session and how specific aspects of his interview sessions went (see Appendix B for a sample of the interview questions). Each interview session was about thirty to forty minutes in length. All the sessions were audio-recorded and later transcribed for analysis. This constitutes the fourth set of data. Finally, my field notes written during the course of the research comprise the fifth type of supplementary data.

3.4.4.1. questionnaire. At the outset of the research, the students were asked to fill out a Profile Sheet. This instrument draws on background questionnaires used by other researchers (Cumming, 1988; Riazi, 1995; So, 1997). The questionnaire sought information on the following: general and ethnolinguistic background, experiences with the Japanese language, self-rating of overall Japanese proficiency, in particular, writing proficiency in L1 and L2(s), motivation for learning Japanese, writing practices in L1 and L2(s), and difficulties experienced while writing in L1 and L2 (Appendix D). When the students’ answers were not clear in the descriptive part of the Profile Sheet, I interviewed them to clarify what they meant.

3.4.4.2. the Japanese Speaking Test (JST). Since one of the aims in the research was to explore the connection between target language proficiency and the topical focus and negotiation patterns in conference, it was necessary to gauge the students’ Japanese proficiency. Ideally, the participants’ Japanese proficiency should be measured both in spoken and written language. However, since a standard test of written Japanese was not available, I selected the JST because of its acceptance in the academic community and its easy accessibility in North
Ameri~a. I also wanted to assess my observation in class that there was a strong correlation between the students' spoken and written proficiency in Japanese.

The JST is a simulated oral proficiency test based on ACTFL's Proficiency Guidelines (1986). It is suitable for evaluation of the level of oral proficiency in Japanese in post-secondary institutions, particularly that of the upper-level students of Japanese. I administered the JST locally in a university language laboratory in January of 1998. I sent Center for Applied Linguistics the taped interviews, which were then sent outside to specially trained raters for assessment. The students' response tapes were rated according to ACTFL's Generic and Japanese Speaking Proficiency Guidelines (1986, 1987). The proficiency band descriptors that accompanied the test results are presented in Appendix E. These bands consist of Novice, Intermediate (low, mid, high), Advanced, Advanced-plus, Superior, and High-superior. The score was reported in terms of these bands.

3.5. Procedures and Measures for Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using a variety of analytical procedures and measures. They include the following: (a) ratings of the students' writing using Hamp-Lyon's (1991) band scale; (b) ratings of the students' revision using a rating scale created for the analysis; and (c) a correspondence analysis between the discourse in the conferences and the students' writing. In the subsequent sections, these procedures and measures for analysis will be described in turn.

3.5.1. Transcription Conventions

As was noted earlier, I first did phonetic transcription and later converted the transcripts to standard modern Japanese, consisting of two syllabaries and Chinese characters (Kanji). The transcription conventions that I used are presented in Table 3.1.

---

26Although a standardized Japanese language test, Japanese Language Proficiency Test (Japan Foundation & Association of International Education, 1994), did exist, it was administered only in a limited number of locations outside Japan. Toronto was not one of the designated locations until recently. It was logistically impossible to have the participants take this test in Toronto at the time of the present study.

27Overall, the results of the JST appeared to be confirmed by the ratings of the students' compositions by the three external raters. However, Keith and Clive, who tended to be taciturn in speech, scored slightly higher in the written mode than in the spoken mode.
Table 3.1. Transcription Conventions

- A hyphen used to indicate an incomplete utterance or false starts. e.g. ‘Well--er--’

. A period used to indicate pauses by one or more periods with a space on either side. The number of periods correspond to the number of seconds of pause. e.g. ‘Yes . . . I do’. In the case of long pauses, length is indicated by numerals. e.g. ‘Yes .6. I do’.

?! ‘?’ and ‘!’ used to mark interrogative and exclamatory intonation, respectively.

CAPS Capitals for emphasis, e.g. ‘I really LOVE painting’.

< > Cases where one is not completely sure that one has heard correctly

* Asterisks used to mark cases where one cannot make out what was said at all. Each asterisk corresponds to one word that was judged to have been spoken.

--- Simultaneous speech. The overlapping utterances are written in consecutive turns and underlined.

Note. Parentheses were used for the transcriber’s comments and interpretation of what was said and the way in which it was said.

3.5.2. Coding of the Conference Discourse

The primary aim in examining the transcripts was to identify patterns of conference interaction and to investigate their possible links with the students’ Japanese proficiency, the goals that they had selected or modified, and the actual content or focus of the talk. Following Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) constant comparative method of analysis, I inductively derived, modified, and refined coding categories through several phases, using a subsample of conference transcripts.

The analytic framework adopted was that of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) (e.g., Halliday, 1984; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). The underlying principle of the SFL analytic orientation to discourse is that of a rankscale, in which each unit consists of at least one unit of the level below. Wells’ (1998) coding scheme, originally developed to examine classroom interaction in first language classroom contexts, uses a generalized hierarchy of units for the analysis of discourse comprising episode, sequence, exchange, move, and act.28 For the current analysis, however, his coding scheme was modified to examine the data at hand. Hence, instead of coding all the ranked units, three units, sequence, exchange, and move, were selected as an

--- Various labels have been used to describe these hierarchical units of discourse. For example, various researchers have referred to larger structures above the level of exchange as “episode” and “sequence” (Wells, 1996; Nassaji & Wells, 2000), “transactions” (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), “topically related sequences” (Mehan, 1979), and so on.
analytic focus. Following Wells (1996), the ‘sequence’ is treated as the basic unit of conversation: it consists of “a ‘nuclear’ exchange and as many ‘bound’ exchanges as are judged necessary by the participants to complete what was initiated in the nuclear exchange”.

Table 3.2. presents a summary of the hierarchy of units used for the analysis of the conference discourse and Figure 3.2. provides a visual representaiton of what is described in Table 3.2.

First, I segmented the transcripts into sequences, defined as all the talk concerned with a single topic. A sequence consists minimally of a nuclear exchange, but it may include any number of additional bound exchanges. While nuclear exchanges are free-standing, bound exchanges depend on the nuclear exchange in some respect. For instance, the dependent exchange develops some aspects of the nuclear exchange through further elaboration, specification, exemplification, and so on. The embedded exchange deals with various types of communication breakdown. Within each sequence, the different types of exchanges were identified (i.e., nuclear, dependent, embedded, or preparatory). Then, within each exchange, the different types of moves were identified (i.e., initiation, response, and follow-up) as appropriate.
Table 3.2. *The Generalized Hierarchy of Units*

1. **Sequence:**
   All the moves required to fulfil the expectations set up by the initiating move in the nuclear exchange around which it is organized.
   *i.e., Sequence --- Nuclear + (Bound)*

2. **Exchange:**
   As the minimal unit of interaction, it consists of an initiating move and a responding move; in certain types of discourse, there may also be a follow-up move.

   **Nuclear Exchange:**
   A free-standing exchange

   **Bound Exchange:**
   All exchanges that are bound to the nuclear exchange (i.e., exchanges that cannot stand on their own but take on their meaning and function in relation to the nuclear exchange):
   (a) **Dependent exchange**
   Exchange that fills out the proposition established in the nuclear exchange in various ways
   (b) **Embedded exchange**
   Exchange that asks for clarification, repetition, repair, and confirmation with respect to the previous contribution in the talk
   (c) **Preparatory exchange**
   Exchange that paves the way for the nuclear exchange

3. **Move:**
   A contribution to an exchange made by a participant in a single speaking turn. However, a turn may involve moves that contribute to more than one exchange. There are three types of moves typically used for the analysis of classroom discourse: initiation, response, and follow-up.

---

Figure 3.2. *Diagram of the Generalized Hierarchy of Units*

![Diagram of the Generalized Hierarchy of Units](image)
Table 3.3. Application of the Coding Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Where did you go for your holiday?</td>
<td>Nucl</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>We went to Greece for three weeks.</td>
<td>Nucl.</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>How did it go?</td>
<td>Dep.1</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Pardon?</td>
<td>Emb.</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>How did it go?</td>
<td>Emb.</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dep.1</td>
<td>Reinitiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oh, we had a wonderful time.</td>
<td>Dep.1</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>That's good.</td>
<td>Dep.1</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What was the weather like?</td>
<td>Dep.2</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Not too hot in June. very pleasant.</td>
<td>Dep.2</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample dialogue in Table 3.3 was devised to illustrate the principle of this coding scheme. This stream of discourse represents one of the sequences that might make up an episode, the whole conversation between A and B. In each sequence, a recognizable focus or topic is initiated in the nuclear exchange; in this case, B's holiday. Every exchange consists of an initiating move and a responding move (and an optional follow-up move). Thus, each sequence is coded for its constituent exchanges and moves; the type of exchange is entered on the left side and the type of move on the right. In labelling exchanges, I used the abbreviations: Nucl for nuclear exchange, Dep for dependent exchange, and Emb for embedded exchange.

In turn 1, a nuclear exchange is initiated by A, asking B about her holiday (nuclear exchange Initiation). In turn 2, B accepts A's initiation and responds to it (nuclear exchange response). At turn 3, having established the topic of the sequence in the nuclear exchange, A further asks B to elaborate on her trip (dependent exchange 1, initiation). In turn 4, there is an embedded exchange initiated by B to indicate she had difficulty understanding A (embedded exchange, initiation). In turn 5, in response to B's request for repetition, A repeats his question and in so doing reinitiates the dependent exchange 1, which he attempted to start at turn 3 (embedded exchange, response; dependent exchange 1, reinitiation). In turn 6, B provides an answer to A's dependent initiation (dependent exchange 1, response). In turn 7, A uses a follow-up move to comment on what B said (dependent exchange 1, follow-up). Within the same speaking turn, he initiates another dependent exchange by asking more information about B's trip (dependent exchange 2, initiation). In turn 8, B responds to A's question (dependent exchange 2, response). Further, samples of coding of the discourse in conferences are provided.
in subsequent sections (3.5.5.3 and 3.5.5.4).

3.5.3. Mean Sequence Length

In order to investigate inter-individual variation in the sequential organization of conference discourse, I used a quantitative measure, mean sequence length (MSL), following Wells (1996). Sequences must contain a nuclear exchange and may contain further bound exchanges. MSL is a measure of the average length of sequences in terms of the number of constituent exchanges. It is calculated by dividing the total number of exchanges by the number of sequences in which they occur. The summed mean value of all three conferences was judged to be the most appropriate measure to use, since conference length varied across tasks and within individuals.

3.5.4. The Coding Categories for the Content of Talk

Each sequence in the transcripts was coded for its topic field, that is to say, what was primarily discussed in the particular sequence. The coding categories used for analysis were based on Cumming (1989) and So (1997), but modified to capture some of the salient features of these conferences. Categories were inductively derived through identification of the topic field, using a subsample of the conference transcripts. All the sequences, excluding those related to task procedures, were classified into one of the seven categories: Gist, discourse organization, dual theme, syntax, lexis, lexis-syntax, and meta-talk (see Table 3.4 for definition). Further, in order to examine the general pattern, two macro categories were created by combining pre-existing categories. The macro category of content consisted of gist, discourse organization, and dual theme, where the focus in the sequences was primarily on text intention. The second macro category of language use consisted of lexis, syntax, and lexis/syntax, where the focus of sequences was on language use, defined as lexico-grammatical and graphophonological realizations of a writer's intended meanings in the written text. Samples of the coding of the conference transcripts for each topic field are provided in Appendix F, since examples for the category of content, sequences tended to be long.
### Table 3.4. *Topic Field*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Field</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gist</strong></td>
<td>Sequence in which the focus is on the propositional content of the student's written text, including clarifying, refining, and elaborating the ideas as well as clarifying the relations between clauses seen as propositions or representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse Organization</strong></td>
<td>Sequence in which the focus is on the organization of the text at levels beyond a single sentence—how different parts of the written text succeed and relate to each other and to the context of situation; it includes concerns about making the text flow better by using cohesive devices and pronoun references that make a link between two or more sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual Theme</strong></td>
<td>Sequence that starts with the clarification of intended meanings and ends with a discussion of a specific passage (text intention) with an alternative proposal at the end of the sequence (primarily lexicogrammatical solution), thereby having two different strands of theme in one sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexis</strong></td>
<td>Sequence in which the focus is on word- and phrase-level lexical concerns, including orthographic conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntax</strong></td>
<td>Sequence in which the focus is on syntactic and morpho-syntactic rules (e.g., post-positions, sentence endings, conjugations) as well as the syntactic structure of a clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexis/syntax</strong></td>
<td>Sequence which focuses on both lexis and morpho-syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>META COMMENTS</strong></td>
<td>Sequences that concern meta-discussion about some aspects of the written text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* “Lang Use” stands for Language Use.

In coding a topic field for each exchange, I treated exchanges as constituents of their superordinate sequences. For example, if the exchange occurred in a sequence that addressed the topic field of “syntax”, that exchange was coded as having syntax as topic. Some sequences had two topics, involving at least one exchange to do with text intention and one to do with linguistic realization of the intention in the target language: I termed this topic field “dual theme”. Sometimes, the same structure also occurred with the two topics conflated in a single exchange, with the teacher making suggestions concerning linguistic formulation in the follow-up move. I termed these Compound Exchanges with Combined K1s (explained in the next section). The compound exchange can be regarded as a special case of the sequence with dual theme as its topic.

#### 3.5.5. *Initiator and Primary Knower*

Many factors contribute to the negotiation of interactants' speech roles in discourse. In
the current coding scheme, I selected particular features for analysis, namely two significant discourse roles and related features. The discourse roles examined were those of initiator and primary knower in the exchange. Initiating and responding are "exchange roles" (Halliday, 1984) that interactants take on in the dialogue, whereas primary knower (K1) relates to who has the critical information with respect to the initiated topic (Berry, 1981).

The initiator nominates the topic of the exchange by an initiation move, thus exercising some control over the flow of discourse if her/his proposal is accepted by the respondent. I coded the initiator for all types of exchanges, although the preparatory exchange was invariably initiated by the teacher (i.e., inviting the students to nominate the topic). Initiating moves were further coded for prospectiveness: Demand, Give, or Acknowledge. A Demand move (e.g., question) typically requires the listener to respond in a Give move (e.g., statement), whereas a Give move used in the initiation typically prompts the listener to Acknowledge. A Give move can be made more prospective such that it demands a response by the addition of a tag (e.g., "isn't it" in English or a sentence final particle ne in Japanese) or rising intonation, which is typically heard as requesting a response. I treated this type of Give move as a subcategory of Demand (Give+). Examining the choice made on the scale of prospectiveness by the initiator was a necessary step, since the selected prospectiveness sets up the anticipated role of the respondent.

The role of K1 was examined with respect to each nuclear and dependent exchange. Berry (1981, p. 126) defines primary knower as "someone who already knows the information" and secondary knower as "someone to whom the information is imparted". Distinguishing the initiator and the primary knower was analytically necessary since these two roles do not necessarily overlap. For example, in the sample dialogue given in Table 3.3, the initiator of the nuclear and the two dependent exchanges was A, but the primary knower with respect to the information at issue was B. The situation was reversed in the embedded exchange: B was the initiator of the exchange asking for repetition and the primary knower was A. In this way, the distinction between the primary and secondary knower allows one to determine whose knowledge base is drawn on in the conversation.

3.5.5.1. mapping primary knower onto exchange roles. Every move and exchange must bring together choices with respect to K1 and with respect to exchange role, which points to the interrelatedness between K1 and exchange roles. Thus, critical to understanding interactants’ roles is an explication of the way in which exchange roles and K1 roles map onto each other. To do so, it was necessary to create an analytical framework to systematically examine the link between the prospectiveness of initiation moves and the anticipated role of respondent. To this end, I examined the contributions made by respondents according to two levels of Give moves: Substantive and Confirmatory. The two levels of response options are
closely connected to the prospectiveness of initiation moves. In initiating an exchange, the initiator can use four types of Initiating Demand, which in turn set up different expectations for the respondent to fulfill (see Table 3.5).

### Table 3.5. The Nature of Commodity Exchanged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four types of Initiation Demand Move</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Asks for a statement (e.g., explanation, opinion) | • Why are you late?  
• What do you think about it?  
• Can you explain what you meant? | Substantive Give: explanation, opinion, specification etc. |
| 2. Asks for identification of participants | • Who came with you?  
• Where did you go? | Substantive Give: specification |
| 3. Asks the respondent to choose between alternatives | • Did you say turn right or left?  
• Did you mean X or Y? | Substantive Give: choice |
| 4. Asks for either confirmation or disconfirmation of the proposal | • You said tomorrow’s lecture was cancelled, right? | Confirmatory Give: confirmation |

**Note.** Subcategories = subcategories of information requested in response

The first two types of Initiating Demand move anticipate completion with a clause or one or more “participants” of the clause (Halliday, 1994). On the other hand, the third and fourth types of Initiating Demand move do not anticipate a clausal completion, but rather a choice between the proposed alternatives or acceptance or rejection of the proposal. Based on these criteria, I coded the responses that completed the demanded information as Substantive and those that merely made a choice between the suggested alternatives and confirmed or disconfirmed the proposal as Confirmatory.

#### 3.5.5.2. loquacious speaker.
I also conducted an additional analysis, to determine who was the more loquacious participant in each nuclear and dependent exchange. I coded the interactant who talked more in terms of number of words in each exchange as the more loquacious speaker. In other words, the basis of the judgement was purely quantitative, and did not involve any qualitative judgement of the nature of the contributions made in the discourse.

#### 3.5.5.3. coding of primary knower roles 1.
Since I have developed a unique framework for analyzing the discourse in conferences, it seems appropriate to give examples taken from the conference data in two subsections so as to describe in detail the analytical steps that I took.

In any social interchange, a participant initiates by using either a Demand or a Give move. In principle, a Demand move anticipates a Give move in response, whereas a Give move anticipates Acknowledge, although this does not always occur in practice.\(^{29}\) In the conference

---

\(^{29}\) For example, it is possible that an initiation Give move gets countered with a response Give move.
discourse, K1 initiation with a Demand move was used only by the teacher: This combination gives rise to a Known Information Question. In Example 1, the teacher used an Initiating Demand move to check the student's knowledge of grammar. What follows is an English translation of the conference talk, which took place in Japanese. For all the ensuing examples, the same format is used.

Example 1: Task 1 (women's status)
Ewan, Sequence 21, Topic field=Syntax

5 T: Well, in the first paragraph, you say Chiisai toki kara josei wa dansei (Since I was small, men and women) Uh, look at the particle no here, dansei no byoodoo da to ometeita (I thought women were equal to men) Can you think of any other particle to use?

6 S: Dansei to joosee wa

7 S: That's right.

In contrast to the first example, the next two illustrate the effect of the role of primary knower being assumed by the initiator who, by choosing to make a Give move, casts the respondent in the role of acknowledger of the initiator's knowledge. In Example 2, Edward as a K1 initiates a sequence, informing the teacher of what he deliberately attempted to achieve in his composition, namely a formal register, "dearu" style. In contrast, in Example 3, it is the teacher who initiates as K1 with a Give move as she imparted her knowledge of Japanese grammar to Craig.

Example 2: Task 2 (effectiveness of lecture)
Edward, Sequence 2, Topic field=Meta comments

18 S: Um in this composition, I tried to use dearu-style as much as possible [rising intonation]

19 T: Uhuh

20 S: But I'm not sure whether I succeeded or not

21 T: I see

Example 3: Task 1 (women's status in society)
Craig, Sequence 3, Topic Field=Syntax
23 T: Next one, it's about the use of a particle again. *Josei no warui chii o sugu wakimasu* (one understands the bad status of women immediately) Uh, usually 'understand' is used as *ga wakimasu*.

24 S: *Ga.*


So far, I have discussed exchanges where K1 is an initiator and K2 is a respondent. Equally important is the reverse configuration, where K2 initiates and K1 responds, since it is possible for a respondent who is the K1 to make a substantive response to the initiation move made by K2. To illustrate this point, a short excerpt from the conference session with Jim is presented. I coded the contributions made by respondents in a K1 role according to two levels: substantive or confirmatory, with the latter including accepting/acknowledging responses (see Table 3.5).

Example 4: Task 2 (effectiveness of lecture) Jim, Sequence 13. Topic field= Dual theme

127 T: *Well, Daini no benefito wa ronriekina joohoo o maru de essei no yooni gakuseitach ni tsutaeru koto ga dekimasu* (The second benefit of the lecture is that it can convey logical information to students like an essay) When I read this passage, I had to stop and think. What was it that you wanted to say here?

128 S: Um, Yes. Well, I was thinking about a particular lecture --- Introduction to classical literature course. Listening to the professor's lecture makes me feel as if I was reading an essay. The class is very interesting, but there is an introduction, main body and conclusion, just like an essay.

129 T: Oh, I see.

As seen in this example, it is not only the initiation that is critical, but also the two roles that the interactants were assigned (or assigned themselves). In turn 127, the teacher initiates with a question asking for explanation or clarification. This move invites Jim to give a substantive response as K1; in this segment, Jim accepted the proposed role and responded to the invitation. On the other hand, if the initiator, although assigning the role of primary knower to the respondent, asserts a proposition and merely invites the respondent's confirmation, the expected response is simply a "yes" or "no". The next extract is one such example taken from the
same conference session:

Example 5: Task 2 (effectiveness of lecture)
Jim, Sequence 21, Topic Field=Lexis

270 T: Well, Seminara wa lekucha to itta i chi no chuukan de
(The seminar is in-between lecture and one-on-one)
Did you mean "individual tutoring" by the expression
ittactich?

271 S: Yes.

In this example, the teacher asks a polarity question, expecting an acceptance or confirmation of her proposal. As illustrated in the two examples, different patterns of interaction can be created by the combination of the roles of initiator and primary knower, and the anticipated role of the respondent set up by the initiator's choice of prospectiveness.

3.5.5.4. coding of primary knower roles 2. In this subsection, examples of one- and three-exchange sequences are presented to illustrate how these special cases were realized in the conference discourse. Example 6 is an instance of a sequence consisting of one compound exchange. In this example, after clarifying the student's intended meaning with respect to "jinrui" (human race), the teacher gave a substantive follow-up move and suggested an appropriate word to capture the intended meaning. Example 7 is an instance of a sequence, where two topics were discussed over three exchanges within one sequence.

Example 6: Task 2 (effectiveness of lecture)
Craig, Sequence 11, Topic Field=lexis

112 T: Sooshite jinrui wa banji o oboemasu (And human race cannot remember everything). I was surprised to see a word jinrui (human race) here since you have been specifically discussing university students. Can you explain what you wanted to say?

113 S: Uh, yes. I meant to say ...it's not possible for humans to remember everything

114 T: Ah, in that case, the term ningen (human beings) would be more suitable

Example 7: Task 3, Edward
Sequence 8, Topic Field=lexis
About the next sentence... Well, I sort of understand what you are trying to get at, but can you explain it? What do you mean by the expression ruijishte here?

Yes, uh, I meant 'in the same way'. Unless salaried workers work under the system of life-time employment, they cannot feel secure. Then, if that's the case, my symptoms [stomachache caused by the stress], em, they experience what I have experienced. So, their stress-induced stomach pain would prevent them from functioning adequately.

The expression ruijishte can be used in two ways. One is in the predicate position as in nantoka ni ruiji shiteiru (similar to something). The other is in a noun phrase such as ruijiyoogen (similar expressions). Do you follow me?

So in this case, I can't use ruijishte?

I would say you want to use the expression onajiyooni (in a similar way) here

OK

In the nuclear exchange, Edward, as the K1 with respect to the intended meaning of the text, gives a substantive response to the teacher initiation. After listening to what Edward meant to say, the teacher in the role of K1 with respect to the Japanese language initiates Dependent Exchange 1 in turn 81 and explains an appropriate use of the Japanese expression at issue with a Give move. She then initiates Embedded Exchange 1 in order to check the student's comprehension. In turn 82, Edward makes an interesting move in response. As the K2, he implicitly acknowledges the teacher initiations in turn 81, but initiates Dependent Exchange 2 with a Give move; it shows that he not only comprehended the teacher's explanation but formulated his own interpretation, asking for confirmation. With rising intonation, he raises the prospectiveness of the initiation move from Give to Give+. In response to Edward's initiation move, the teacher, as the K1 with respect to the Japanese language, suggests an appropriate expression to use. As Example 7 shows, complex patterns of interaction can be constructed, since every move and exchange must bring together choices with respect to both K1 and exchange roles.

3.5.5.5. an overview of primary knower analyses. Sequences involving a number of bound exchanges can have a variety of patterns as a result of interactants taking different roles.
and making different types of contributions in each exchange. Since this complexity cannot be adequately addressed by considering only who initiates sequences and exchanges, I extended my analysis to include an examination of each nuclear and dependent exchange on four dimensions in terms of knower roles: (a) primary knower in the exchange; (b) whether the primary knower was initiator or respondent; (c) the nature of the contribution made by K1 (either substantive or confirmatory); and (d) the topic field under discussion.

For the first dimension, I identified the primary knower (K1) as either S (student) or T (teacher) in each exchange. To examine the second and third dimensions, I created four categories: Initiate Demand (K1 asking a known-information question); Initiate Give (K1 making a statement); Response Substantive Give (K1 making substantive response); and Response Confirmatory Give (K1 making a confirmatory/acknowledging response). These four categories were used to code exchanges with a single K1.

In cases where there were two K1s, that is to say, exchanges where the teacher as primary knower with respect to the target language provided follow-up to the student’s contribution as primary knower about text intention, these were treated as “Combined Primary Knowers”; here, I identified both K1s in each exchange and coded the contributions made in follow-up moves as either substantive or confirmatory Gives. Thus, compound exchanges were coded using the same categories as for the single K1 exchange. Due to this coding procedure, the number of K1 tokens exceeds the number of exchanges.

Finally, to investigate the relationship between the interactants’ roles and the topic field, I coded the contributions according to the topic field under discussion. I coded exchanges, using the categories described in the preceding two sections with some modification. In the previous analyses, I distinguished three macro-level categories in the topic field: content, language use, and meta. For the purpose of this analysis, I divided the macro-topic of content in my earlier analyses into two, since dual theme has an element of both content and language use. I coded all nuclear and dependent exchanges accordingly and separately tallied the results for the teacher and the students.

3.5.6. Verification of Reliability of the Coding

To establish the reliability of coding of the discourse data, I selected 20% of the transcripts from each student with an equal representation of the three tasks. I asked an independent coder, a Japanese/English bilingual Ph.D. student in the second language education program who was experienced in discourse analysis to code the selected transcripts. The coder and I practiced coding to clarify the criteria, discussing any differences that emerged. We then independently coded all the selected transcribed discourse data.
The coding was conducted in five stages (see Table 3.6). First, we identified sequence boundaries. Where there was disagreement, a final version was negotiated, which provided the basis for the second stage, the identification of topic field. The third stage was similar to the first and involved identification of exchange boundaries. After disagreements had been resolved, at the fourth stage, the exchanges were coded for the initiator and type of exchange. Again, we discussed the coding decisions upon which we disagreed, and negotiated a final version. At the fifth and final stage, we coded for subcategories in nuclear and dependent exchanges, that is to say, prospectiveness of the initiating move, primary knower of the exchange, and the more loquacious speaker in the exchange. I calculated the inter-rater agreement for each of these five stages of coding (the number of agreement over total coding decisions multiplied by 100). The average for each stage was: (a) sequence boundary (87.9%); (b) topic field (87.2%); (c) exchange boundary (84.3%); (d) initiator of the exchange and exchange type (90.4%); and (e) three subcategories (91.6%, 91.4%, 96.5% respectively). These results are reported in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6. Results of Test of Inter-rater Agreement for the Discourse Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Level</th>
<th>Coding Decisions Made at Each Coding Stage</th>
<th>Coding Categories</th>
<th>Inter-rater Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>a  Sequence Boundary</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b  Topic Field</td>
<td>Gist, Discourse Organization, Dual Theme Lexis, Syntax, Lexis/Syntax, Meta Comments</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>c  Exchange Boundary</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d  Initiator, Exchange Type</td>
<td>Student, Teacher; Nuclear &amp; Bound Exchanges</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e  Nuclear/Dependent Exchanges</td>
<td>Prospectiveness</td>
<td>Demand (including Give+), Give, Ack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Knower</td>
<td>Student, Teacher, Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loquacious Speaker</td>
<td>Student, Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.7. The Coding Categories for the Functions of Embedded Exchanges

I coded embedded exchanges in terms of initiator and function. The function of the embedded exchange is determined by its initiating move, as this move sets up expectations for the responding move. Using a subsample of the data, I developed the data-based coding categories. As an initial step, I used categories of discourse features proposed by "interactional modification" studies in SLA research, such as comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests (e.g., Gass & Varonis, 1985, 1994; Long, 1980, 1996; Long &

However, these proposed categories did not adequately differentiate the functions found in the current data. I therefore decided to modify these categories. First, I subcategorized clarification requests into three according to what needed to be clarified: (a) general failure of understanding the message; (b) form-related problems with respect to specific lexical and morpho-syntactical items; and (c) reformulation. The label, reformulation, was created to distinguish cases where a clarification request made by one participant resulted in the other’s reformulation of her/his own utterance. In most cases, it was the student who signaled incomprehension in the initiating move to which the teacher responded by reformulating her utterance. Second, I treated comprehension checks as a subcategory of confirmation requests. Third, I added two categories: other-completion and other-correction (e.g., Pica & Doughty, 1985; Shi, 1998). The category of other-correction was a move made by the teacher to provide an accurate linguistic model to the student. All cases of other-correction in the follow-up move were treated as initiating an embedded exchange, whether they were responded to by the student or not. Table 3.7 presents a summary of the coding categories (see Appendix G for coding samples).

Table 3.7. Coding categories for the function of embedded exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Realization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Communication failure</td>
<td>Request for repetition, indicating that a failure of taking in the message at a global level has occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Form-related problems</td>
<td>Request for clarification and assistance with respect to specific lexical, morpho-syntactical, and phonological items that are problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Reformulation</td>
<td>Request for clarification that triggers voluntary reformulation of the respondent’s previous utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Confirmation requests</td>
<td>Request that seeks confirmation with respect to the well-formedness of the preceding utterance or the speaker’s intention or the hearer’s uptake with respect to the meaning of the previous utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Other-completion</td>
<td>Joint construction of an utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Other-correction</td>
<td>Provision of an accurate linguistic model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.7.1. verification of reliability of the coding. I selected 20% of all the embedded exchanges in the data to check the reliability of the coding. I asked the same rater who helped me with the overall coding of the discourse data to code the selected transcripts. We practiced coding to clarify the criteria, discussing any differences that emerged. We then independently coded all the selected data. The inter-rater agreement reached 91.9%. 
3.5.8. Intermediate Versus Advanced Groups

At a preliminary stage of the discourse analyses, differences between the students with advanced or higher Japanese proficiency and those with intermediate-level proficiency appeared consistently across a variety of the analyses. Since the level of Japanese proficiency emerged as a major variable, I decided to systematically investigate its effect on the conference interactions. Accordingly, I divided the students into two groups. Based on the JST results, I classified Ewan, Cindy, Clive, Chris, and Craig into the intermediate group and June, Jim, Edward, and Keith into the advanced group. Although Keith’s JST rating was intermediate-high, I included him in the advanced group for two reasons. First, in the first semester, it became clear that his literacy skills in Japanese considerably surpassed his oral language skills. Second, he had passed the first level of Nihongo Nooryoku Shiken (Japanese Proficiency Test), an authoritative test of overall Japanese proficiency (Japan Foundation & AIE, 1994). The first level certifies that students have sufficient language proficiency to study at a Japanese university. Considering his ease with written Japanese, it seemed appropriate to classify him as advanced.

3.6. Rating of Written Texts

3.6.1. Writing Assessment Instrument

To rate the students’ written products, I selected an established writing assessment instrument in English language testing, Hamp-Lyons’ (1991a) 9-point scale, consisting of the Global Scale (holistic scoring) and the Profile Scale (multiple-trait scoring). I decided to use only the Profile Scale, since my primary interest was in examining what kinds of improvement would be found in different aspects of the students’ writing performance between first and final drafts. I judged that the multiple-trait scoring used in the Profile Scale more appropriate than the primary-trait or holistic scoring used in the Global Scale. As Hamp-Lyons notes, “the multiple-trait procedure possesses psychometric properties that enhance the reliability of single number scores built from components” (1991b, p.252).

Hamp-Lyons’ scale, known as the New Profile Scale, was developed to be used in the writing component of the British Council’s English Language Testing Service (ELTS) test (1980-89). It was intended for non-native speakers of English who plan to attend college or
university in Britain (Hamp-Lyons, 1991a, 1991b; Hamp-Lyons & Henning, 1991).30 The task type and scoring procedures of this writing test reflect its purposes. Although the scale was not intended to measure writing proficiency in Japanese per se, I judged that its band descriptors were general enough to use in a language other than English and well-suited to the argumentative writing that the students produced in this research. However, there were obvious differences between the ELTS and my research context in terms of languages involved, purposes, writing conditions, and so on.

The Profile Scale has five components: communicative quality, organization, argumentation, linguistic accuracy, and linguistic appropriacy. The component scores are weighted equally, each having a maximum of 9 points. During the preliminary rating session, the three raters and I examined comparable samples of JFL expository writing that my former students had produced. We decided to modify the original 9-point scale by reducing the number of bands from 9 to 6 points for a number of reasons. First, because more than half of the participating students were at the intermediate level of Japanese proficiency, the bottom two bands were not applicable to the samples. Second, the raters could not agree on what constituted good Japanese writing, particularly in terms of argumentation. Third, in addition, the raters had difficulty in discriminating what the top three bands actually looked like in Japanese writing. For these reasons, we decided to eliminate the top and bottom two bands to make the rating reliable (see Appendix H for the modified scale). Although this modification was useful in measuring improvement in the written productions of less proficient students, it was not sensitive enough to assign fine-tuned scores to the two highest scoring students.

In addition to Hamp-Lyons’ scale, a pair-wise comparison evaluation was conducted by means of a blind comparison between first and final drafts. The raters were not informed which were first and second drafts. I asked the raters to match randomized compositions into pairs written by the same writer (i.e., first and final drafts) one task at a time, to tell which composition they judged of better quality, and to give their reasons in writing. All of them wrote their comments in English.

3.6.1. Raters of Written Texts

Three raters, native speakers of Japanese and also JFL teachers at universities in the United States, rated the 54 compositions using Hamp-Lyons’ (1991a) band scale in the modified form described above. At the time of the rating, two raters were doctoral students specializing in foreign language pedagogy and linguistics respectively, and the third one was a

30Hamp-Lyons also developed the multiple trait writing assessment for the University of Michigan’s undergraduate entry assessment, which is similar to the New Profile Scale mentioned here (Hamp-Lyons, 1991a; Hamp-Lyons & Reed, 1990).
university JFL faculty with a Ph.D. degree in second language education. All of them had experience teaching and evaluating JFL students' writing.

All the compositions were typed before handing them to the raters in order to avoid any bias in judgement. In each writing task, the order of compositions to be rated was randomized using a randomized number of 1-18 calculated on Minitab. The raters were then given three sets of 18 compositions in a randomized sequence (e.g., task 3-1-2 or 2-3-1).

3.6.2. Verifications of Reliability of the Rating

Prior to the rating, the three raters and I had a preliminary session for two hours to clarify the criteria for assessment. This entailed an examination of how we interpreted each component of the scale and the band descriptors for each component against our ratings of five sample compositions. Although the raters agreed to a large extent in their assignment of scores for the components of linguistic accuracy, linguistic appropriacy, and communicative quality, they had more divergent criteria as to what constituted good argumentation and discourse organization in Japanese.

The same three external raters independently rated the students' writing using a modified version of Hamp-Lyons' scale. Inter-rater reliability was calculated with respect to each component in Hamp-Lyons' scale using Cronbach's alpha formula: communicative quality=.91; discourse organization=.89; argumentation=.80; linguistic accuracy=.96; and linguistic appropriacy=.93.

3.7. Revision Rating

The revision rating scale was developed in order to identify and discriminate a range of revisions made in the students' texts. It was inductively derived and refined through several phases, using a subsample of the students' writing. It was informed by taxonomies of revisions and revision rating scales used by other researchers (e.g., Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Faigley & Witte, 1984; Ferris, 1997; Hyland, 1998; Phinney & Khouri, 1993; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1998). Villamil and de Guerrero's revision rating scale was used as a model at the initial stage. Their scale, comprising the five components of content, discourse organization, grammar, vocabulary and mechanics, is based on the ESL Composition Profile (Jacobs et al., 1981). However, it became evident that their scale needed to be modified for the current purpose since it could not discriminate the type and scope of revision in some cases. Although there was a high degree of overlap between the type and scope of many instances of revision,
there were also cases where the two did not overlap. For example, with Japanese cohesive devices such as *sokode* (now), *sarani* (further), and *sitage* (hence), I treated the type of revision as discourse organization, since these transitional devices help make the argument stronger, but the scope would be at the group/phrase level. Therefore, in the final version of the current scale, both the types and scope of revision were differentiated and coded separately: distinguishing what type of revision was made and what unit of the text was affected by the revision. First, I examined the scope of revision as a first analytical step to identify the general pattern in the data. Then, in order to distinguish the nature of revisions more precisely, I analyzed the types of revision.

### 3.7.1. Scope and Types of Revision

As shown in Table 3.8., for the analysis of scope, three main linguistic levels were used: (a) within group/phrase; (b) within sentence; and (c) beyond sentence. The beyond sentence level was further divided into three subcategories: addition/deletion, rearrangement, and macro-level revision. In developing the criteria for the scope of revision, I incorporated some of Faigley and Witte's (1981, 1984) revision taxonomy: the dimension dealing with the span of text involved in the change—graphic, lexical, phrasal, clausal, sentence, and multi-sentence levels—and the dimension dealing with operations of revision such as addition, deletion, and substitution. Given the relatively small number of writing samples involved in this study, I conflated Faigley and Witte’s two dimensions (the span of text involved in the change and the type of revision operations) in the current scheme. Since the scope of revision was used to identify general patterns in the data, three macro levels were adopted rather than the six classes used in Faigley and Witte. For the level of beyond sentence, revision operations were identified in order to distinguish the nature of revisions made involving different operations at this level.

For the types of revision, five categories were used: (a) lexis, (b) morpho-syntax, (c) rewriting, (d) text effectiveness, and (e) content/discourse organization. In order to code salient features of revisions in some of the students' writing, the categories of rewriting and textual effectiveness were added. The criteria for the type of revision are presented in Table 3.9. Samples of the revision ratings are attached in Appendix I.

---

31The beyond sentence level revision corresponds to what Faigley and Witte (1981) called multi-sentence change.
Table 3.8. **Criteria for the Scope of Revision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Level</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Group/Phrase</td>
<td>within nominal/verbal/adjectival groups and postpositional phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sentence</td>
<td>within a sentence, i.e., relationships within or between clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Beyond Sentence</td>
<td>either within one paragraph, beyond individual sentences, or beyond a paragraph, but within a whole text; applicable to the changes made in relation to the whole text, including cohesive devices such as “cohesive conjunctions” (Halliday, 1994) to connect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Addition/Deletion**: revisions intended to strengthen the structure of the text by adding or deleting sentences.
- **Rearrange-ment**: revisions in which the writer attempts to rearrange the structure of text by changing the order of sentences within and across paragraphs.
- **Macro-level**: revisions in which the writer, for example, adds a new paragraph and does a paragraph-level revision.

In classifying the types of revision, when the original passage had no obvious lexico-grammatical errors, revisions in the category of rewriting were double-coded either as *textual effectiveness* or *content/discourse organization*. Rewriting concerned with fixing lexico-grammatical errors was not double-coded. What follows is a typical example of double-coding: *le wa tenketekina chantoshita kazoku no kao desu kara* (because home is a typical proper face of the family). In this example, the original passage did not involve lexico-grammatical errors, but it was not appropriately phrased in Japanese. Edward rewrote the whole clause to make it more effective as Japanese text. The passage in his first draft shown above was coded as rewriting and textual effectiveness. Due to this procedure of double coding, 866 tokens were identified for type of revision, despite the fact that there were only 837 changes in the corpus as a whole.

Table 3.9. **Criteria for the Type of Revision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Lexis</td>
<td>all lexical changes made, including orthographic changes, that are intended to achieve linguistic accuracy according to the conventions of Standard Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Morpho-syntax</td>
<td>all morphological and syntactic changes made that are intended to achieve linguistic accuracy according to the conventions of Standard Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rewriting</td>
<td>revisions made when the writer opts for rewriting a certain proportion of text rather than correcting the immediate error(s). Such revisions typically start with lexico-grammatical inaccuracy and involve rewriting of a clause or a clause complex in which the original error(s) occurred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.7.2. Verifications of Reliability of the Coding

As with the codings for the discourse data, codings for revision rating were checked for reliability. I asked another Japanese/English bilingual Ph.D. student in the second language education program with expertise in linguistics to be the second coder. I extracted 20% of the data from each student with an equal representation of the three tasks to check the reliability. The rater was given the selected compositions in first and final versions with changes numbered and highlighted in yellow marker. She was also given coding sheets in which the selected revisions were written. After practicing coding and reaching a high level of agreement, we coded the selected data independently. The inter-coder agreement was 91.2%.

### 3.8. Correspondence between Text Revision and Conference Discourse

In order to examine the relationships between the discourse in conference and students' revisions in their subsequent drafts, I developed a framework for the correspondence analysis: a bi-directional analysis starting from both conferences and revisions. In the first mode, the analysis was carried out from discourse sequences to revisions, and in the second, the analysis was carried out in the reverse order, from revisions to sequences. At the outset of the analysis, I numbered all the previously identified revisions in the students' writing. In the first analysis, I compared each sequence of the conference discourse with revisions, then made judgements as to whether the discussion in the conference led to revisions in the subsequent draft. When a correspondence was clearly traced from a sequence to a revision, the revision number was entered next to the relevant sequence on the coding sheets of the discourse data. When the content of a discourse sequence contained no grounds for making a revision, an asterisk was entered to mark the absence of a correspondence. In cases where potential revisions were
discussed in the conference, but clearly not taken up in the students' final drafts, the absence of correspondence was marked as 0.

Critically important to this analysis was defining the parameters of the correspondences between the two modalities in a reliable manner. Through several cycles of data analysis, I inductively arrived at six categories of correspondence that captured salient features in the data. I first identified four different types of correspondence then added two additional ones. The four categories I identified first were: (a) explicitly discussed in the discourse and incorporated in the writing in one-to-one correspondence; (b) linguistic model provided by the teacher without explicit discussion; (c) extrapolated from one example that was explicitly discussed; and (d) general discussion leading to substantive revisions. I subsequently divided the first category into three further categories in order to distinguish the differential nature of uptake evidenced in the students' written texts, i.e., inaccurate revisions, verbatim revisions, and successfully modified revisions. Then, using the categories presented in Table 3.10, I classified all the identified correspondences into the six categories. Examples of these coding decisions are provided in Appendix J.

Table 3.10. Coding Categories for Correspondence Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Explicitly discussed in the discourse and incorporated in the writing in one-to-one correspondence (e.g., lexico-grammatical revisions)</td>
<td>Explicitly discussed in the discourse and incorporated in the writing, although displaying some inaccuracies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Model provided</td>
<td>The particular revision was not explicitly discussed, but a linguistic model was provided by the teacher in the conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Extrapolated</td>
<td>Several revisions were made based on extrapolation from one example (e.g., lexical items, stylistic concerns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Revisions were clearly motivated by the discussion, but not identifiable in a one-to-one correspondence since they involved larger units of text, for example, by adding or deleting sentences or paragraphs or rearranging certain portions of text. This correspondence type occurred primarily, though not exclusively, in relation to the topic field of gist and discourse organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.1. Subcomponents to Research Question 2

First, I carried out the correspondence analyses not only in relation to students as a
whole but also for the two proficiency-based groups. The features that I tallied were: (a) the number of sequences with/without subsequent revisions; (b) the number of revisions made with/without a traceable link to the conference; and (c) the number of tokens of each correspondence type. In comparing the two groups, I used a Chi-Square test, where appropriate. Since the complex nature of the intertextual relationship between the two modalities became evident during the analysis, I subdivided the main research question #2 into six components in order to address this complexity:

First analysis
1. What proportion of sequences led to revision?
2. For sequences that led to revisions, what was the average number of revisions that occurred per sequence?
3. Of those sequences without a link to revisions, what was the proportion of sequences where potential revisions were discussed without any uptake?

Second analysis
4. Of all the revisions made, what proportion of revisions could be linked to the discourse in a conference?
5. Of all the revisions linked to the discourse in conference, what types of correspondence were identified?
6. Of the remaining revisions that occurred without conference talk, what were the types of revisions made?

In the second analysis, for each student and task, I made a list of all the revisions that were found not to be linked to the conference then double-checked the coding. This procedure was necessary to ensure the accuracy of my coding, since in some cases it was difficult to trace the link by examining from sequences to revisions alone. The category of "extrapolated" correspondence was a case in point, since several revisions might be made from the discussion of one example.

3.8.2. Verifications of Reliability of the Coding

In order to check interrater reliability on these two analyses, the same rater who had helped me with the revision rating coded 20% of the correspondence data that I had selected. I extracted 20% of the conference transcripts from each student in proportion to the length of her/his conferences and with an equal representation of the three tasks. The rater compared the conference transcripts with the corresponding written texts in first and final drafts, identified the occurrence and absence of correspondence, marked cases where conference discussion did not lead to revisions, and classified each revision linked to a conference sequence according to the six categories. The interrater agreement was 94.1%.
3.9. Case Studies

In addressing the third research question, regarding the extent to which the students' modes of engagement with the writing activity were explicable in terms of their differential proficiency in the target language, I conducted qualitative analyses of five mini-case studies. I selected five students for analysis by the process of purposive sampling, in order to make meaningful comparison across cases and to represent the key points on the dimensions of biliteracy (Hornberger, 1989). Instead of focusing on each data set separately, I used all the data collected for each student in combination for the case-study analyses. This allowed both the data sources and methods to be triangulated to increase “credibility” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), conventionally referred to as internal validity.

The analysis proceeded in three phases. First, to get a sense of the data as a whole, I went through all the data sets and wrote down my overall impressions about each of the participating students. Second, I narrowed my focus down to the five case-study students. I summarized the characteristics of each student's discursive practices in conferences (documentation of representative episodes of interaction), the nature of their revisions, and the intertextual relationship between the conference talk and their revisions, as well as the information gleaned from the Profile Sheet, their Japanese proficiency measured by the JST, and other supplementary sources. I also compared these features across the cases in light of the salient features of each student. Second, I analyzed the transcripts of retrospective interviews with all the students. Third, I synthesized the findings of the interview analysis with the aforementioned other components with respect to each of the case-study students.

In the following subsections, I describe a theoretical construct, Hornberger's continua of biliteracy, that helped me understand biliteracy dimensions on which the participating students differed, as well as the steps that I took in carrying out the analysis of retrospective interviews.

3.9.1. Hornberger's Continua of Biliteracy

In considering the dimensions of biliteracy, I have drawn on Hornberger's (1989) proposal of continua of biliteracy. According to Hornberger, biliteracy is multidimensional, involving a set of social contexts, a sequence of individual development, through which people acquire abilities to read and write in an additional language, and a set of media, which people may experience and relate to in variable ways in more than one language. Each of these aspects

32Also see Cumming's (1994) discussion of Hornberger's continua of biliteracy.
of biliteracy includes several interrelated characteristics depicted as continua. In terms of the social contexts of biliteracy, I presumed that they were similar across the students, in that they were learning JFL in Canada where English is the dominant language. This socio-political aspect was important in interpreting the findings of the current study as a whole.

However, in carrying out qualitative analyses of the students' performance, I focused on the students' differing experiences with biliteracy. As Hornberger notes, people's development of biliteracy may combine and distinguish several aspects of literacy. These differences may be described in terms of six continua, of which I have particularly drawn on four in the light of the current data.\(^{33}\) First, the students differed on the receptive-productive continuum, which concerns differences in people's biliteracy experiences in relation to the amount of reading and writing in a L2 (in the present case L2=Japanese). Second, the students also diverged in their experiences in the oral language-written language continuum, which concerns how spoken and written language are used in combination or separately to greater or lesser degrees or for distinct social functions. With respect to the students' experiences with biliterate media, they differed in the two aspects: the continuum of similarity-dissimilarity between language structures and literate practices in the L1 and L2; and the continuum of convergent-divergent scripts, wherein orthographic conventions of writing systems are similar or different between the students' L1 and L2.

3.9.2. Analysis of Retrospective Interviews

I created several analytical steps to address the data at hand, consulting Lincoln and Guba (1985). First, I went through all the interview transcripts to get a sense of the range of answers among the students as a whole and noted major themes in the data as a whole and in relation to the students' target language proficiency. Second, I narrowed my focus to the case-study students. Using the interview questions (Appendix B) as a guide, I summarized each student's response to each question, extracting their main ideas. As was noted earlier, each of the three interviews, for which David was responsible, consisted of: (a) eight core questions addressing the specifics of a particular conference session and task performance; and (b) new questions added in the light of the preceding interview, which were of a general nature, asking about such things as the students' composing and revising strategies and their perceptions about writing in Japanese (not applicable to the first task). I grouped the eight core questions into four main topics and the additional eleven questions into eight topics, then summarized each student's responses according to these topics. Fourth, based on the preceding analysis of

---

\(^{33}\)One continuum that was not mentioned here is that of L1-L2 transfer. Although this is an important aspect of biliteracy, I did not feel that I had sufficient information about it to include it as one of the key criteria of my qualitative analyses.
the interviews with the case-study students, I generated a number of hypotheses about the students’ writing performance, then tested these hypotheses against the whole interview data set to determine their validity—Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) “negative case analysis” that involves considering alternative interpretations of the data, particularly locating pieces of data that would challenge the researcher’s reconstruction of reality. For instance, I hypothesized that the higher the students’ target language proficiency the more likely they would be to use native-like composing strategies. When I found evidence that refuted my hypothesis, I went back to the data to consider why that was the case. This dialectic process helped to establish similarities and differences across the five cases.

3.10. Summary of Research Methods

I have reported the research methods in the light of the three research questions guiding this study. To address the first question concerning factors that influenced the teacher-student discourse in conference in terms of content of talk and patterns of interaction, I examined the internal organization of the discourse on seven dimensions. For the second question concerning the students’ subsequent revisions, I first analyzed the students’ written texts in terms of improvement from first to final drafts and the nature of revisions made. Then I inquired into links between the conference talk and subsequent revisions, using a correspondence analysis developed for the study. In addressing the third research question regarding the students’ differential performance, I conducted qualitative analyses of five mini-case studies. Table 3.11 summarizes the way in which the three research questions, the collected data, and the methods of analyses map onto each other. In addition to the methods of analyses described so far in this chapter, I used non-parametric statistical tests, such as a Chi-square test and a paired t-test, where appropriate, to assess whether differences observed were statistically significant.
Table 3.11. *Summary of Research Questions and Methods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Main Data for Analysis</th>
<th>Methods of Analyses</th>
<th>Main Categories of Analysis</th>
<th>Supplementary Data for Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. How did the teacher-student conferences contribute to students' subsequent revisions? A) What was the nature of the revisions made? B) What relationships could be observed between the discourse in conferences and the students' revisions in their subsequent drafts?</td>
<td>Written texts&lt;br&gt;1. Writing scores&lt;br&gt;2. Students' first and final drafts</td>
<td>1. Writing assessment (Hamp-Lyon's scale)&lt;br&gt;2. Paired t-test&lt;br&gt;3. Revision rating&lt;br&gt;4. Chi-square test&lt;br&gt;5. Correspondence analysis</td>
<td>Comparison between first and final drafts&lt;br&gt;1. Writing scores&lt;br&gt;2. Revision rating&lt;br&gt;a) scope&lt;br&gt;b) type&lt;br&gt;3. Categories for correspondence</td>
<td>1. Interview questions&lt;br&gt;2. Hornberger's continua of biliteracy&lt;br&gt;3. Link among various sources of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent were the students' modes of engagement with the writing activity explicable in terms of their differential proficiency in the target language?</td>
<td>All the data sources</td>
<td>Interpretive case studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


CHAPTER 4:
CONFERENCE DISCOURSE, TEXT REVISIONS, AND THE INTERTEXTUAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THEM

As the teacher of the class, I had noticed that the ways in which the students participated in the conferences and revised were strongly related to their Japanese proficiency, which was hardly surprising. My next step as a researcher was to put my casual observation under empirical investigation. In doing so, I aimed at explicating more precisely the nature of these differences and the factors contributing to them through systematic analyses of the conference transcripts and the students' written products. In this chapter, I report the findings of my investigation in terms of: (a) general patterns observed in the data; and (b) the first two research questions concerning the content of the talk and the patterns of interaction in the conferences, the students' subsequent revisions in the final drafts, and the link between them. In the present chapter I use quantitative analyses to establish general patterns across the sample as a whole; then in the following chapter, I address the third research question through case studies of five members of the class who were selected to represent some of the major dimensions on which the sample varied.

This chapter consists of three main sections. First, in order to ground the subsequent analyses, additional contextual information about the students is provided at the beginning of the chapter. drawing on supplementary sources of data, i.e., the questionnaire, the JST ratings, and the students' goal statements and evaluations of goal attainments. The following two main sections address research questions 1 and 2 respectively. Having reported the findings for the analyses of the teacher-student discourse in conferences, I then present those for the analyses of the students' writing samples and for the relationship between the conference discourse and students' revisions.

4.1. Participants' Profiles

Based on the information obtained by the questionnaire and some follow-up clarification interviews where necessary and the results of the JST, I compiled the participants' profiles. I categorized individual attributes in order to make a systematic comparison across the students. The criteria for categorization are described, where relevant, in the subsequent subsections. A summary of the students' profiles is presented in Table 4.1; each of the nine students was identified by a pseudonym beginning with the first letter of the ethnic group to
which s/he belongs. The participants' profiles are described in the subsections that follow.

Table 4.1. Participants’ Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>student</th>
<th>ethnic background</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>strongest spoken language</th>
<th>strongest written language</th>
<th>self-rating of LI writing</th>
<th>LOR in Japan in the past 5 years</th>
<th>self-rating of overall Japanese proficiency (cf. class)</th>
<th>self-rating of overall Japanese proficiency (cf. native)</th>
<th>self-rating of Japanese writing (cf. native)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese English</td>
<td>Japanese English</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Anglo Canadian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan</td>
<td>Anglo Canadian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive</td>
<td>Chinese Canadian</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Chinese Canadian</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Chinese Canadian</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>Chinese Canadian</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LOR = length of residence

4.1.1. Participants’ Educational Background

In terms of medium of education, the students can be classified into three groups: monolingual, successive-bilingual, or simultaneous-bilingual groups. The first group consists of the students who were educated monolingually: Ewan in English and Keith in Korean. Edward falls somewhere between the monolingual and bilingual groups, but is closer to the monolingual end of the continuum. Except for his one-year immersion in a Japanese high school, he was primarily educated in English. All three listed their respective first languages as their strongest oral and written language. The successive-bilingual group is constituted by the four Chinese students. Clive, Cindy, Chris and Craig, who were educated bilingually, first in Chinese and then in English. After acquiring their Chinese literacy skills, they came to Canada in their adolescence, completed high school, and moved on to university. On average, they had an English-medium education for nine years. These students identified their strongest oral and written language as Chinese. June also belongs to this second group, since before she started her schooling in English at age thirteen, she had attained Japanese literacy skills. She was educated in three languages, the latest being English for the past ten years. June listed her strongest oral and written language as both Japanese and English. The third group is represented by Jim, who had simultaneous exposure to English and Japanese since birth. He
was schooled in English, but at the same time, he studied Japanese as a heritage language. Jim identified his strongest oral and written language as English.

4.1.2. Participants’ Experiences with the Japanese Language

4.1.2.1. age, specialization, and motivation to learn Japanese. The participants ranged in age from twenty to twenty four. They were registered in the Faculty of Arts and Science, and the majority had double majors within the social sciences and/or the humanities. All of them expressed a high degree of interest in studying Japanese. Their listed reasons for studying Japanese clustered around three items in the questionnaire: their general interest in Japanese language and culture, their need to learn it for their future career, and their future plans to study in Japan. The two ethnic Japanese included their desire to maintain their cultural heritage.

4.1.2.2. experiences of learning Japanese. The participants’ learning experiences with Japanese can be roughly classified into three: (a) formal classroom instruction only; (b) a varied degrees of immersion experience in Japanese speaking communities in conjunction with formal instruction; and (c) self-tutoring. The four Chinese students and Ewan belonged to the formal instruction only group (university JFL courses). Edward was somewhere between the formal instruction and the immersion groups, as he had one-year immersion in a Japanese high school. With minimum Japanese, he had to learn the language in a “sink or swim” fashion. Since then, he had continued his Japanese study through private tutoring. In the placement test, he was classified as advanced and was immediately placed in fourth year courses. The two ethnic Japanese students in the second group were similar in their use of Japanese at home, but significantly different in the degree of formal education in Japanese. Whereas Jim studied it as a heritage language from grades 1 to 12 once a week for three hours, June studied up to grade 9 at Hoshuuuko, an overseas Japanese school in which the curriculum stipulated by the Japanese Ministry of Education is implemented. Keith was the only student without any formal instruction, belonging to the third group; he taught himself Japanese while living in Korea, using tapes and textbooks.

Four students had some experience of living in Japan. Cindy stayed in Japan for 6 weeks in 1997, attending a summer Japanese course. Jim took his first trip to Japan in the early 1990s, a three-month trip, to see his relatives. As was mentioned, Edward had one year of immersion in high school. June lived in Japan for several years from the ages 1-3 and 10-12. As for the rest of the six students, except for a brief visit, none of them had experience living in Japan.
4.1.3. Ratings of Language Proficiency

4.1.3.1. JST ratings. June was rated superior, and Jim and Edward were rated advanced. The five students who studied JFL at the university in Canada and Keith were rated intermediate: Keith and Ewan at intermediate-high, Clive and Cindy at intermediate-mid, and Chris and Cary at intermediate-low. The rating of these learners as intermediate was in line with the reported Japanese proficiency attained by other North American students of Japanese at comparable institutions of higher education (Makino, 1992).

4.1.3.2. Self-ratings of overall Japanese proficiency/writing proficiency in L1 and Japanese. Overall, the students rated their writing proficiency in their dominant language of literacy highly. Five out of the nine students rated themselves as excellent writers in their dominant literacy languages, and the remaining four rated themselves as good writers. The students also assessed their general and writing proficiency in Japanese under two conditions - compared with their peers in class and with native speakers of Japanese. Results of the self-ratings, summarized in Table 4.1, indicate that the four Chinese students, June, and Edward assessed their Japanese writing proficiency as on a par with their general Japanese proficiency, when compared with the class: excellent (Edward) good (June and Clive), and fair (Cindy, Chris, Craig, Ewan). However, with the exception of June, when compared with native speakers, most of them rated their Japanese abilities lower, either as fair or poor. Jim rated his general Japanese proficiency higher than his Japanese writing abilities. Keith also rated his general proficiency higher than his writing proficiency, as compared with the class. The general pattern was that all the eight students who listed a language other than Japanese as their dominant language of literacy indicated a perceived gap in writing proficiency between their DLL and Japanese; in some cases, the differences were at opposite ends of the scale, i.e., L1 writing (excellent) vs. Japanese writing (poor). Most of them seemed to consider their general proficiency and writing proficiency in Japanese as about the same, which corresponds to my observations in class.

4.1.3.3. ranking of four skills in Japanese. When asked to rank their four skills in Japanese, the students gave three kinds of answers, which appeared to correspond to the way they learned Japanese. The students who had studied JFL at the university without other exposure to the Japanese language gave identical responses; they assessed reading the strongest, writing the second, listening the third, and speaking the weakest. Keith, who had taught himself Japanese with few opportunities to talk with Japanese people, ranked the four skills in the same manner as these four students. Ewan ranked writing as the strongest since this mode of communication allowed him sufficient time to express what he wanted to say without external pressure (Interview, Feb.11, 1998). The two students who had experience of living in Japan, Edward and Cindy, ranked the four skills in the same order: reading the strongest,
writing the second, speaking the third, and listening the fourth. They stated that, in speech, they could usually manage to say what they wished to say with some circumlocution, but listening was more challenging since it was other interlocutors who were in control of the information given. What is common among these non-Japanese students is that they ranked their literacy skills higher than their oral language skills. In contrast, the two ethnic Japanese students ranked speaking the strongest. While June ranked reading the second, listening the third, and writing the least strong, Jim ranked listening the second, writing the third, and reading the fourth. His knowledge of Chinese characters was assessed at a grade 4-5 level when he took a vocabulary test in class earlier in the academic year. He remarked that he found reading Japanese discouraging because of the large number of Chinese characters unknown to him (Interview, Feb. 11, 1998).

4.1.4. Participants' Goals for Revision

According to their evaluations of goal attainment at the end of the research, most of the students noted that they maintained their initial revision goals throughout the semester. However, three students, June, Edward, and Chris, stated that they either added to or modified their goals due to their experiences of conferencing. The most striking was Edward, who completely changed his focus for revision as the result of conferencing. Table 4.2. presents a summary of the students' initial goals, changes made to their goals, and evaluations of goal attainment on the scale of 5 to 1 (completely to not at all).

More variation was noted in terms of micro-level goals than macro-level goals across the students. More advanced learners were concerned with a wider range of vocabulary, the written register, and clarity of expression, whereas intermediate-level learners were concerned with overall grammatical accuracy, particularly correct use of particles. The asterisks in the table indicate the revision goals that the students stated as their primary goal in the initial consultation session with me. On the one hand, the more advanced students, June, Jim, and Edward, selected goals that were interrelated and complementary. Although Edward's initial goal was strictly on language use, he shifted to focus on the overall structure and clarity of meanings, which encompass both language use and macro-organization of the prose. On the other hand, intermediate-level students indicated that they were primarily interested in micro-level goals, that is to say, improvement in their language use. In sum, three students whose Japanese proficiency was at the advanced level or higher according to the ratings of the JST selected goals that supported one another, while other students were more focused on the issue of language use.
Table 4.2. Summary of Participants' Revision Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>JST</th>
<th>Macro revision goals</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Ev</th>
<th>Micro revision goals</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Ev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td><em>To compose a piece of writing that conveys the intended meanings effectively</em></td>
<td>Added goal: a persuasive prose that could withstand counter-argument</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>To expand vocabulary and to use a wider range of expressions; To become able to use the register of written Japanese better</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td><em>A more fluent, &quot;stylistic&quot; sentence structure</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>A broader range of vocabulary, mainly to assist the macro-level goals</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>No initial goal</td>
<td>Added goal: the overall structure and clarity of meanings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Use of mimetic words, onomatopoeia, and idiomatic expressions</em></td>
<td>Modified goal: clarity of expressions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Logical connection between paragraphs</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Correct use of particles and noun-verb collocation</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Logical support of thesis</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Proper use of particles</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Intermediate-high</td>
<td>Persuasive prose</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Correct use of verbs and particles</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Improvement of the overall content and structure</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Use of appropriate phrases and less grammatical mistakes</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Intermediate-low</td>
<td>Fluent expression; Clearly stated ideas</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Correct use of particles and grammatically appropriate sentence constructions</em></td>
<td>Added goal: appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>Intermediate-low</td>
<td>Clear expression of ideas</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Appropriate choice of words</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. JST = the JST ratings of the students' Japanese proficiency; Ev = evaluation; Inter = Intermediate; Asterisks indicate what the students identified as their primary goals in their revision (June and Jim stressed that they wanted to pay equal attention to micro and macro goals).

4.2. Analysis of the Teacher-Student Discourse in Conferences: Findings for Research Question 1

This section presents the results for research question 1: What factors influenced the teacher-student discourse in conferences in terms of the content of the talk and the patterns of interaction? I report the findings of a series of discourse analyses at several levels in order of increasing analytical delicacy: (a) the topics on which the student focused in sequences; (b) the relationship between MSL and the topics; (c) the internal organization of sequences in terms of types of exchanges; and (d) other issues pertaining to exchanges. My focus in this section, as was noted previously, is to establish general patterns in the discourse data and the relationship between these patterns for the sample as a whole and in relation to the two proficiency-based groups.
4.2.2. MSL in Individual Conferences

To get a general sense of the data, I did a rough estimation of the length of conferences in terms of the number of words used for each conference, then calculated the mean value of each conference. Conference length varied across the students and across the three tasks. The average length was 2424 words with a range of individual variability from 1566 to 3421 words. Means of each cycle of conferences (tasks 1, 2, and 3) in terms of number of words were 1317 (task 1), 3171 (task 2) to 2066 words (task 3). A number of factors, including the students’ interactional styles, their Japanese language proficiency, and the time available for studying Japanese at a particular point in the semester, seemed to influence the length of their conferences. However, no clear pattern emerged from the analysis.

As a next step, I coded each sequence in the transcripts for its topic field, that is to say, what was primarily discussed in the particular sequence, using the seven micro-topics—*gist, discourse organization, dual theme, lexis, syntax, lexis/syntax, meta-comments*—and tallied the results. To examine general patterns of distribution, however, I used the three macro-topics, i.e., *content (gist, discourse organization, and dual theme), language use (lexis, syntax, lexis/syntax), and meta comments*. I then calculated mean sequence length (MSL) in each of 27 conferences according to the three macro-topics, in order to determine the average length of sequences (see Table 4.3). I observed that: a) across the students, sequences focusing on *language use* occurred more frequently than those focusing on *content* and *meta comments*; b) for all students, sequences focusing on *content* tended to produce longer MSL than those focusing on *language use*; c) in general, the students with advanced Japanese proficiency tended to have a higher proportion of content-related sequences than those with intermediate Japanese proficiency; and d) MSL for each individual student tended to be relatively stable across the three conferences.
Table 4.3. *Mean Sequence Length in Individual Conferences in Relation to Macro-Topics*\(^{34}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>Meta Comments</th>
<th>Each conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># of Seq</td>
<td>MSL</td>
<td># of Seq</td>
<td>MSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* June, Edward, Jim, and Keith were advanced Japanese proficient students, whereas Ewan, Cindy, Clive, Chris, and Craig were intermediate Japanese proficient students; "seq" stands for sequences.

Based on these observations, I decided to concentrate on the relationship among MSL, topic field, and the behavior of the two proficiency-based groups. Analyses were conducted with respect to proficiency-based groups and the sample as a whole rather than individuals. In reporting the results of discourse analyses in each of the ensuing subsections, I will first present overall findings across all students and then in terms of comparisons between the intermediate and advanced groups.

**4.2.2.1. frequency and distribution of topic fields.** As is presented in Table 4.4.

---

34To speculate about nonoccurrences of certain topics in some of the students' conferences, individual variations in their approaches to the task appeared to play a major role. For example, Keith, a Korean student who was an extremely confident writer in his L1, commented in the interview that he wanted to focus on language-related issues since he could deal with content-related issues on his own. Craig, who was not an analytical learner of L2, only had one sequence related to *meta comments.*
overall, the topic of *language use* occurred much more frequently than the topic of *content* (73.71% vs. 21.31%). That is, most conference sequences focused on the topic of *language use*. Using a Chi-square test, conducted on the raw frequencies of sequences for each of the seven micro-topics and with respect to each proficiency group, I found a significant difference between the two groups in their selection of topic field: $X^2 (6, N = 14) = 64.18$, $p < .001$. Major contributions to the difference were made by the cells for *gist* and *discourse organization* in the macro-topic of *content* and for *syntax* in the macro-topic of *language use*. Additionally, I conducted another Chi-square test on raw frequencies of sequences for each of the three macro-topics and with respect to the two groups. The difference in topic selection between the two groups was significant at the level of .001: $X^2 (2, N = 6) = 19.99$, $p < .001$. While the advanced group selected the macro-topic of *content* more than expected, the intermediate group selected *content* much less than expected.

Although the topic of *content* occurred less frequently than *language use* for both groups, the proportion of *content* as topic was significantly higher for the advanced than for the intermediate group (30.22% vs 16.25% respectively). Likewise, within the topic of *language use*, a differential pattern was observed. The proportion of *syntax* was significantly lower for the advanced group (17.03%) than for the intermediate group (39.69%). In addition, for the advanced group, *lexis* occurred most frequently of all topic fields (42.86%), whereas for the intermediate group, it was *syntax* that occurred most frequently (39.69%), though closely followed by *lexis*. *Meta comments*, which involved evaluation of the student’s writing performance, occurred slightly more frequently in the advanced than in the intermediate group.

These findings suggest links among the students’ proficiency levels in Japanese, their revision goals, and their selection of topic fields in conference. The primary goals specified by the students in the intermediate and advanced groups reflected their Japanese proficiency. While the intermediate group centered on lexico-grammatical concerns, particularly morpho-syntax, the advanced group focused on such things as clarity of meaning in the presentation of their ideas, stylistic sophistication of their prose, and use of a broader range of vocabulary. The types of revision goals, in turn, contributed to their topic selection in conference sequences.
Table 4.4. Frequency and Distribution of Topic Fields in Sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Field</th>
<th>Intermediate Group</th>
<th>Advanced Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gust</td>
<td>52 (16.25)</td>
<td>55 (30.22)</td>
<td>107 (21.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc. Org.</td>
<td>5 (1.56)</td>
<td>15 (8.24)</td>
<td>20 (3.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Theme</td>
<td>38 (11.88)</td>
<td>14 (7.69)</td>
<td>53 (10.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexis</td>
<td>257 (80.31)</td>
<td>113 (39.69)</td>
<td>370 (73.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>127 (39.69)</td>
<td>78 (42.86)</td>
<td>194 (38.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lex/Syn</td>
<td>14 (4.38)</td>
<td>4 (2.20)</td>
<td>18 (3.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta Comments</td>
<td>11 (3.44)</td>
<td>14 (7.69)</td>
<td>25 (4.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320 (100%)</td>
<td>182 (100%)</td>
<td>502 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Frequencies (i.e., raw counts of sequences for all students’ conferences) appear in regular type face; percentages appear in parenthesis.

4.2.3. Mean Sequence Length and Topic Field

In the previous analysis, each sequence was treated as having an equal value irrespective of its length. However, in order to test my observation that MSL was related to the types of topic, using the data presented in Table 4.3, I calculated MSL for each of the seven micro-topics and for the two-proficiency based groups. The results, presented in Table 4.5, show that for both the advanced and intermediate groups there was a tendency for MSL to be greater in the macro-topic of content as compared with language use. However, there were differences between the two groups in the micro-topic that produced the greatest MSL. For the advanced group, it was gist that produced the longest MSL, whereas for the intermediate group, it was dual theme, in which text intention and lexico-grammatical concerns were addressed equally. I then compared the average MSL for the two macro-topics of content and language use, excluding the topic of meta comments due to its infrequent occurrence. Using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test, I found that MSL were significantly greater for content-related sequences than for language use-related sequences: $T=4.0, N=25, p<.01$. Thus, although fewer sequences overall were devoted to the topic of content than to language use, sequences focusing on content tended to be significantly longer.

Considering a statistically significant difference between the intermediate and advanced groups in their topic selection in conjunction with the findings reported in this section, I expected the mean values of MSL to be significantly different between the two groups. However, using a Mann-Whitney U Test on the overall MSL of each conference (presented in Table 4.3), I found no significant difference between the groups in the average value of MSL in individual conferences: $U = 88, n_1 = 12, n_2 = 15, 2$-tailed, $ns$. To explain these contradictory findings, I next decided to examine the internal organization of sequences, shifting my unit of
analysis to exchanges.

Table 4.5. Mean Sequence Length in Relation to Topic Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Field</th>
<th>Mean Sequence Length</th>
<th>Mean Sequence Length</th>
<th>Mean Sequence Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate Group</td>
<td>Advanced Group</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Gist</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disc Org</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Theme</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use</td>
<td>Lexis</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lex/Syn</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Disc Org = discourse organization

4.2.4. Internal Organization of Sequences

The previous analyses found that although fewer sequences overall were devoted to the topic of content than to that of language use, sequences focusing on content tended to be significantly longer for both groups. However, since the analyses of sequences cannot specify the types of bound exchange that occur within sequences, I conducted a series of additional analyses from several viewpoints at the level of exchange, so as to investigate the internal organization of sequences.

To recap briefly, exchanges are of two types: nuclear exchanges, which can stand alone, and bound exchanges, which are dependent on the nuclear exchange in some way. Bound exchanges are sub-categorized into three types: Dependent exchanges, which add new information to the on-going discourse through further elaboration, exemplification, and enhancement of the proposed topic; embedded exchanges, which primarily deal with some type of communication breakdown; and preparatory exchanges, which prepare for nuclear exchanges, for example, by inviting students to nominate the topic.

I first tallied raw frequencies of these four types of exchanges with respect to the three macro-topics in each conference. The results are summarized in Table 4.6. Excluding the topic of meta comments and preparatory exchanges from the analysis due to their relatively infrequent occurrence, I examined how dependent and embedded exchanges were distributed in the two macro-topics of content and language use for the sample as a whole, comparing raw frequencies of dependent and embedded exchanges for each sequence in relation to the two topics. I found that while the sequences focusing on content had a significantly greater proportion of dependent than embedded exchanges, those focusing on language use had a significantly lower proportion of dependent than embedded exchanges: $X^2(1, N = 4) = 49.97,$
p < .001. I then looked into the group difference in terms of the overall distribution of dependent and embedded exchanges. I tallied raw frequencies of dependent and embedded exchanges separately for the two proficiency-based groups and carried out a Chi-square test. I found that the advanced group produced a greater proportion of dependent exchanges than expected and a smaller proportion of embedded exchanges, whereas the results for the intermediate group were in the opposite direction: $X^2(1, N = 4) = 4.04, p < .05$.

Table 4.6. *Topic Fields and Exchange Types in Individual Conferences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conf</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>Meta Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ncl</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>Emb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers are raw counts of exchanges tallied for each conference; conf. = conference.

To summarize, the types of topic influenced the distribution of dependent and embedded exchanges. While content-related sequences tended to produce a significantly greater
proportion of dependent than embedded exchanges, language use-related sequences produced a significantly greater proportion of embedded than dependent exchanges. Further, in concordance with these findings, the advanced group, which tended to select the topic of content much more than the intermediate group, produced a higher proportion of dependent than embedded exchanges, suggesting that the students in the advanced group tended to develop the initiated topic substantively beyond the nuclear exchange. Conversely, the intermediate group, which tended to select the topic of language use predominantly over the topic of content, produced a higher proportion of embedded than dependent exchanges, suggesting that more time was invested in repair negotiation than developing the topic substantively. Thus, although the average value of overall MSL for the intermediate and advanced groups did not differ significantly, the internal organization of sequences in terms of the proportion of dependent and embedded exchanges was significantly different between the two groups.

4.2.5. Initiator

In order to explain these differences further, I selected two significant discourse roles for analysis at the level of exchange, namely initiator and primary knower. While the role of initiator has been much discussed in the literature, the role of K1 has scarcely been addressed. For that reason, I focused more on the role of K1 in my subsequent analyses. Because of my analytical focus, I present the results for the initiator analysis briefly in this section, then I report the results of a series of K1 analyses more extensively in the sections that follow.

I first focused on the initiator of the exchange for all exchanges (see Table 4.7). Of all exchanges, the teacher initiated 76.93%, while the students initiated 29.07%. However, although the teacher was the dominant initiator in both nuclear and dependent exchanges (83.52% for the advanced and 91.87% for the intermediate), for both groups the proportion of student initiations increased in the dependent exchange. However, in the embedded exchanges, the tendency for the teacher to be the dominant initiator was reversed. Of all embedded exchanges, the teacher initiated 47.35%, while the students initiated 52.65%. However, a Chi-square test, conducted on raw counts of student and teacher initiation in nuclear, dependent, and embedded exchanges (excluding preparatory exchanges), showed a significant difference between the advanced and intermediate groups: \( X^2(5, N=12) = 29.71, p<.001 \). Inspection revealed the difference was found in the extent to which the students initiated in nuclear and dependent exchanges. The advanced group initiated much more than the intermediate group in

\[ \text{35} \] excluded preparatory exchanges since the teacher initiated these on all occasions. This was attributable to a distinct instructional function of preparatory exchanges.
these two types of exchange.

Table 4.7. Distribution of the Initiator in Relation to Exchange Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nuclear</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
<th>Preparatory</th>
<th>All exchanges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Inter</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Inter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Initiation</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Initiation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. S = student; T = teacher. Numbers are raw frequencies of teacher-initiated and student-initiated exchanges.

To refine the first initiation analysis of exchange, I then examined the prospectiveness of the initiation moves in nuclear and dependent exchanges, which was where the substance of the discourse was constructed. This additional analysis was necessary since the prospectiveness of the initiation moves sets up the anticipated role of the respondent. A scale of prospectiveness consists of three abstract types of moves: Demand, Give, and Acknowledge. In initiating an exchange in social interaction, a participant either (a) gives something to the other participant or (b) demands something from her/him. Results for the analysis of prospectiveness of teacher and student initiation moves are presented in Table 4.8. Both the teacher and the students used Demand moves more frequently than Give moves (4.48 times more for teacher and 1.98 times more for students). A Chi-square test, carried out on raw frequencies of Demand and Give moves made by the teacher and the students, showed a significant difference between the groups in the distribution of student Give moves: $X^2(3, N = 8) = 32.79, p < .001$. The advanced group produced a significantly higher proportion of student Give moves, whereas the intermediate group produced a significantly lower proportion (16.8% vs. 2.50% for the nuclear; 15.25% vs. 3.01% for the dependent; 11.3% vs 2.77% for both types of exchange combined)
Table 4.8. **Prospectiveness of Initiation Moves in Nuclear and Dependent Exchanges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prospective ness</th>
<th>Nuclear Exchanges</th>
<th>Dependent Exchanges</th>
<th>Nucl &amp; Dep Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter.</td>
<td>Adv.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Demand</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Give</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Demand</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Give</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Numbers are raw counts of initiation moves coded according to their prospectiveness.

In sum, the two initiator analyses revealed that in the conferences: (a) the teacher tended to initiate nuclear and dependent exchanges much more frequently than the students, whereas this tendency was reversed in embedded exchanges in favor of the students; and (b) the advanced group produced a significantly higher proportion of Give moves in initiation than the intermediate group.

4.2.5.1. **Loquacity.** Initiating has the effect of dominating the conversation by nominating the topics of exchanges. Another way to dominate the conversation is by producing more words per turn. Frequently, one interactant talked more, as measured by the proportions of total words in each exchange. Relative loquacity was determined by identifying the more loquacious speaker for each nuclear and dependent exchange. The analysis, summarized in Table 4.9, shows that overall, the teacher was more frequently the more loquacious participant: 76.5% of all nuclear exchanges, 70.8% of all dependent exchanges. However, although the intermediate and advanced groups were similar with respect to the length of the conference \((M = 2483 \text{ words vs. } 2350 \text{ words})\) and MSL \((3.51 \text{ vs. } 3.60)\), using a Chi-square test, I found a significant difference between the two groups in the extent to which the students in the two groups tended to be the more loquacious participant: \(X^2(1, N=4) = 62.81, p < .001\) for nuclear exchanges; \(X^2(1, N=4) = 42.35, p < .001\) for dependent exchanges.

Inspection revealed that in both tests all the cells contributed to the difference. In both types of exchange, while the extent to which the advanced group became the more loquacious was more frequent than expected, this tendency was reversed for the intermediate group. In percentages, the proportion of the advanced group being the more loquacious speaker was 43.2% for nuclear and 44.3% for dependent exchanges, whereas for the intermediate group, the proportion dropped to 12.2% for nuclear and 19.5% for dependent exchanges.
Table 4.9. Frequency of Teacher or Student as the More Loquacious Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nuclear Exchanges</th>
<th>Dependent Exchanges</th>
<th>Nucl &amp; Dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers are raw counts of tokens for the more loquacious speaker.

4.2.6. Primary Knower Analyses

The analyses in the previous section tapped into who controlled the flow of the information, how the anticipated role of the respondent was set up by the prospectiveness of the initiation move, and who talked more in nuclear and dependent exchanges. However, these analyses did not fully explicate the nature of the interaction within exchanges. In order to explore this, I next conducted an overview Kn1 analysis for the sample as a whole.

I decided to focus on nuclear and dependent exchanges only, excluding embedded exchanges, for the following reason. In nuclear and dependent exchanges, the role of Kn1 is negotiated through the selection of topic for discussion and is dependent on who has the expertise or the solicited knowledge. Because of this feature, a topical shift considerably affects the way Kn1 contributions are made. By comparison, in embedded exchanges, who becomes a Kn1 is more stable; it is almost always the previous speaker who becomes the Kn1, since repair negotiation. the main function of embedded exchanges, is with regard to what has been said in the preceding conversation.

In carrying out an overview Kn1 analysis, I tallied raw frequencies of all Kn1 contributions with respect to the three main variables: (a) initiator/respondent; (b) the nature of Kn1 contributions (Initiation Demand or Give moves; Substantive or Confirmatory Response Give moves); and (c) the four macro-topics.36 In regard to the third variable, for the purpose of this analysis, I divided the macro-topic of content in my earlier analyses into two subcategories—content and dual theme. It was analytically necessary to make this distinction between them since the topic of dual theme has an element of both content and language use, which implicate combined Kn1s.

The results for the analysis of all Kn1 contributions are presented in Table 4.10. As was earlier shown in Table 4.7, I (the teacher) initiated 83.5% in nuclear and dependent exchanges.

36In regard to the second variable, given that the teacher initiated nuclear and dependent exchanges more frequently than the students, it was important to identify the type of information that was solicited in the initiation slot (e.g., asking known-information questions or asking "authentic" questions). Equally important was an examination of the nature of contributions by the respondents (substantive or confirmatory responses).
(914 initiations out of 1095). However, Table 4.10 shows that only 23.2% of my initiations were made in the role of K1 (212 K1 initiations out of 914 teacher-initiation). From this it follows that the majority of my initiation moves (86.8%) were made as K2, casting the students in the role of K1. In comparison, the students in the role of K1 initiated 33.1% (60 exchanges out of 181) in these two types of exchanges (see Table 4.7). Furthermore, 57.0% of all the K1 contributions were made by the students.

In terms of the distribution of roles, a differential pattern between teacher and students was observed. For both the teacher and the students, the most frequently occurring category in the K1 role was that of Response: Substantive Give (59.6% vs. 61.5%). Overall, for the students, it was Response: Substantive and Confirmatory Give that were dominant (92.2%). In initiating nuclear and dependent exchanges, I (the teacher) used Give moves much more frequently than Demand moves (85.8% vs. 14.2%). Therefore, in the role of K1 initiator, I used “known-information” questions, which is conducive to the Initiate-Response-Evaluate exchange structure, in low proportion (14.2% of all my K1 initiations). In addition, these “known-information” questions occurred primarily in sequences related to language use where I wanted to check the students’ understanding of lexico-grammar.

Thus, the teacher’s and the students’ contributions to the conference discourse were qualitatively different. Although I acted as initiator much more frequently than the students (212 out of 272 K1 initiation), in their role as respondents, the students contributed more Substantive Give moves than the teacher (473 out of 819 K1 substantive response). Also, the topic field had an effect on the teacher-student distribution of K1 role. In sequences that did not focus solely on lexico-grammar, the students became the K1 more frequently than the teacher (93.5% K1s for content; 72.2% K1s for dual theme; and 84.8% K1s for meta comments). By contrast, the tendency for the students to be a K1 was reversed in respect to language use (43.4%).
Table 4.10. Primary Knower Contributions in Relation to Macro-Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K1 CONTRIBUTIONS</th>
<th>4 MACRO-TOPICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gist/Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Initiate Demand</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Give</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Response Substantive Give</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Confirmatory Give</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Initiate Demand</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Give</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Response Substantive Give</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Confirmatory Give</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers are raw counts of tokens of K1 contributions. A = Single K1 in cases where there was a single K1 within one exchange; B = combined K1s in cases where there were two K1s within one exchange. Initiate Demand = K1 asking a known-information question; Initiate Give = K1 making a statement; Response, Substantive Give = K1 making substantive response; Response, Confirmatory Give = K1 making a confirmatory/acknowledging response.

4.2.6.1. teacher versus student distribution in all K1 contributions.

After establishing general patterns of K1 contributions for the sample as a whole, my next step was to examine the difference between the intermediate and advanced groups in relation to their K1 contributions. I conducted subanalyses, focusing on the four main dimensions from the overview analysis of K1 contributions that I had selected: (a) teacher vs. student distribution for all K1 contributions; (b) teacher vs. student distribution of K1 roles in relation to the macro-topics; (c) the nature of contributions that teacher and students made in the role of K1; and (d) teacher vs. student distribution of discourse roles and contributions in relation to the topic fields.

First, I examined the teacher-student distribution of K1 contributions with respect to nuclear and dependent exchanges (see Table 4.11). Using the Chi-square test, I examined raw frequencies of K1 contributions made by the teacher and the students for each of these types of exchange. I found a significant difference between the two groups: \( X^2(1, N =4) = 8.19, p < .01 \) for the nuclear exchanges; \( X^2(1, N =4) = 19.18, p < .001 \) for the dependent exchanges. In both types of exchange, the advanced group played the K1 role more frequently than expected, whereas the pattern was in the opposite direction for the intermediate group. The proportion of exchanges in which the students played the K1 role was 61.3% for the advanced and 53.2% for the intermediate group in the nuclear exchange, and this tendency became more pronounced in the dependent exchange: 68.3% for the advanced and 51.6% for the intermediate group. In
these two tests, all the cells contributed to the difference.

Table 4.11. *Teacher versus Student Distribution in All K1 Contributions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nuclear exchanges</th>
<th>Dependent exchanges</th>
<th>Nuclear + Dependent combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Student Teacher Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>222 (53.2) 195 (46.8) 417 (100)</td>
<td>231 (51.6) 217 (48.4) 448 (100)</td>
<td>453 (52.4) 412 (47.6) 865 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>133 (61.3) 84 (38.7) 217 (100)</td>
<td>183 (68.3) 85 (31.7) 268 (100)</td>
<td>316 (65.2) 169 (34.8) 486 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Raw counts of the teacher and students’ K1 contributions in nuclear and dependent exchanges appear in regular type face; percentages appear in parentheses.

4.2.6.2. *the nature of contributions made in the role of K1.* I also examined the specific nature of contributions made in the role of K1 by the teacher and the students (see Table 4.12). I conflated the single and combined K1 (two K1s within one exchange) categories so that I could use Chi-square test. I conducted two separate Chi-square tests. In the first test, in order to determine whether the teacher initiated exchanges differently for the two proficiency-based groups, I compared raw frequencies of the four types of teacher K1 moves used for the intermediate and advanced groups: Initiation Demand, Initiation Give, Response Substantive Give, and Response Confirmatory Give. No statistically significant difference was found in the way I (the teacher) interacted with the two groups in the role of K1: $X^2(3, N=8) = 2.87, \text{n.s.}$ However, there was a tendency for me in the role of K1 to make Initiate Demand moves more frequently to the intermediate group than to the advanced group (16.8% vs.7.0%) and to make Response, Confirmatory Give moves more frequently to the advanced group than to the intermediate group (15.2% vs.2.7%). The distribution of topics selected by the two groups resulted in the teacher assuming the role of K1 much more frequently with the intermediate group;

In the second test on the students’ K1 moves, I compared raw frequencies of the three types of moves (Initiation Give, Response Substantive Give, and Response Confirmatory Give) for the intermediate and advanced groups. A significant difference was found between the two groups in the nature of contributions they made in the K1 role: $X^2(2, N=6) = 51.06, p<.001.$ The cells which made major contributions to the difference were Initiation Give and Response Confirmatory Give moves. While the advanced group produced many more Initiation Give moves than expected, the intermediate group produced much fewer than expected. This tendency was reversed in Response Confirmatory Give moves; the advanced group produced much less Response Confirmatory Give than expected, whereas the intermediate group
produced more than expected.

Table 4.12. The Nature of Contributions Made in the Role of KI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Initiation</th>
<th>Student Response</th>
<th>Teacher Initiation</th>
<th>Teacher Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Give</td>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>Confirmatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in the table are raw counts of moves.

4.2.6.3. teacher versus student distribution of KI roles in relation to macro-topics. I then examined all KI contributions in relation to the topic fields (see table 4.13 for results). The general pattern across the students was that in the four macro-topics of content, dual theme, and meta comments, the students became K1 much more frequently than the teacher (94.5% for content; 71.2% for dual theme; 85.7% for meta comments), whereas in language use, it was the teacher who acted as K1 much more frequently (62.1%). A Chi-square test, conducted on raw counts of moves tallied for each group and for the four macro-topics, showed a significant difference between the two groups in the distribution of K1 roles in relation to the macro-topics: $X^2(7, N=16) = 184.18, p<.001$. The difference was found in the extent to which the students became the K1 in the topics of content and dual theme and the extent to which the teacher became the K1 in language use; the difference was most marked in content. In the topic of content, the students in the advanced group played the K1 role much more frequently than expected and the intermediate group much less frequently than expected. In sequences focusing on the topic of dual theme, this pattern was reversed. In the topic of language use, although the teacher tended to be K1 much more frequently than the students, the teacher was found to play the K1 role much less frequently than expected with respect to the advanced group.

Table 4.13. Teacher versus Student distribution of KI Roles in Relation to 4 Macro-Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Dual Theme</th>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>Meta</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(16.0)</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
<td>(30.1)</td>
<td>(40.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26.2)</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td>(8.5)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(24.1)</td>
<td>(28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.1)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(27.9)</td>
<td>(28.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. S = student; T = teacher. Raw counts of moves appear in regular type face; percentages appear in parentheses.
4.2.6.4. students' K1 contributions in relation to macro-topics. As a final step, I combined the last two analyses and examined the effect of the topics on the distribution of teacher-student discourse roles and the nature of their contributions in nuclear and dependent exchanges. Only the results of a Chi-square test on the students' contributions are reported, since it was not possible to conduct a Chi-square test on the teacher's contributions due to there being too many cells with zeros. I conducted the test on raw frequencies of moves made by the intermediate and advanced groups according to the four macro-topics (see Table 4.14). A significant difference emerged between the two groups in the way they adopted roles and made contributions in relation to the types of topic: $X^2(11, N=24) = 200.52, p<.001$. The cells which made major contributions to the difference are Initiation Give and Response Confirmatory Give moves in the topic of content as well as Response Confirmatory Give moves in the topics of dual theme and language use. The advanced group produced a significantly higher proportion of Initiation Give moves in the topic of content, whereas the intermediate group initiated with Give moves much less frequently than expected. In dual theme and language use, it was the intermediate group that produced a significantly higher proportion of Response Confirmatory Give moves than expected, whereas the advanced group produced significantly less than expected.

Table 4.14. Students' K1 Contributions in Relation to 4 Macro-Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Dual Theme</th>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>Meta Comments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter</td>
<td>4  24  8</td>
<td>0  79  59</td>
<td>5  161  94</td>
<td>2  14  3</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>30  67  30</td>
<td>30  30  8</td>
<td>7  83  27</td>
<td>9  15  7</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>34  91  38</td>
<td>3  109  67</td>
<td>12  244  121</td>
<td>11  29  10</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Moves: A = Initiation Give; B = Response Substantive Give; C = Response Confirmatory Give. Numbers are raw counts of the students' K1 contributions.

4.2.7. Functions of Embedded Exchanges

In the analyses of initiator and K1, I focused on the two types of exchange that constitute the substance of the talk. However, embedded exchanges have important functions to serve as devices for conversation repair. Based on the accumulating evidence, I predicted that there would be differences between the two proficiency groups in the way they made use of the functions of embedded exchanges. I classified all the embedded exchanges in the corpus according to initiator and function: (a) communication failure; (b) form-related problems; (c) reformulation; (d) confirmation requests; (e) other-completion; and (f) other-correction. As was noted in Chapter 3, the first three functions were subcategories of clarification requests.
Overall, the function of confirmation requests was used most frequently (39.18%), followed by form-related problems (25.43%), and reformulation (17.22%). However, as Table 4.15 displays, although the proportion of student initiation was comparable between them, a significant difference was found between the advanced and intermediate groups in the way they used the embedded exchange: \(X^2(15, N = 24) = 232.01, p < .001\). In contrast to the advanced group for whom confirmation requests occurred much more frequently than expected and most frequently of all the categories (31.46%), with the intermediate group it was ‘clarification requests’ (all three subcategories combined), that occurred much more frequently than expected and most frequently of all the categories (45.91%). In particular, the second function, request for clarification and assistance with respect to form-related problems, was the most frequently occurring category within the three subcategories (27.38%). In terms of teacher initiation, the function of other-correction was used considerably more frequently with the intermediate than with the advanced group. In addition, the teacher made use of confirmation requests much more frequently than expected with the advanced group.

### Table 4.15. Frequency and Distribution of Functions of Embedded Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>A (Advanced)</th>
<th>B (Intermediate)</th>
<th>A+B Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Initiation</td>
<td>T Initiation</td>
<td>S Initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication failure</td>
<td>1 (1.88)</td>
<td>1 (1.88)</td>
<td>33 (7.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form-related problems</td>
<td>32 (15.02)</td>
<td>5 (2.35)</td>
<td>115 (27.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>23 (10.80)</td>
<td>4 (1.88)</td>
<td>70 (16.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation requests</td>
<td>67 (31.46)</td>
<td>56 (26.29)</td>
<td>54 (12.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-completion</td>
<td>5 (2.35)</td>
<td>8 (3.76)</td>
<td>8 (1.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-correction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (2.35)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>131 (61.35)</td>
<td>82 (38.65)</td>
<td>280 (66.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>213 (100)</td>
<td>420 (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Frequencies (i.e., raw counts of embedded exchanges for the intermediate and advanced groups) appear in regular type face; percentages appear in parentheses.*

#### 4.2.8. Summary of Findings for Research Question 1: What factors influenced the content of the talk and the patterns of interaction in the teacher and student conferences?

The analyses of discourse in the conferences showed both commonalities across all students and differences between the intermediate and advanced groups. In particular, a complex interplay of two key discourse roles, i.e., initiator and primary knower, and the types of
contributions made by the two participants shaped differing patterns of interaction in the conferences. From the perspective of dominance, for all students, the teacher emerged as the more frequent initiator in nuclear and dependent exchanges. By contrast, in embedded exchanges, it was the students who were the more frequent initiators. Further, the analysis of the prospectiveness of initiating moves revealed that it was not only the quantity of initiation but the manner of initiation, evidenced in the choice of prospectiveness, that was important. In all conferences Demand moves soliciting a substantive answer were the most frequently selected initiating move by the teacher, both in nuclear and dependent exchanges. Although the students as a whole initiated the exchange with a Demand move more frequently than with a Give move, the advanced group produced a significantly higher proportion of initiation Give moves (e.g., developing a topic further; by counterarguing) than the intermediate group, particularly in dependent exchanges. In the analysis of loquacious speakers, similarly, the teacher emerged as the principal loquacious speaker, although the students in the advanced group took the role of more loquacious speaker much more frequently than did the intermediate group, to the extent that in many sequences they talked as an equal partner in the conversation, measured by the number of words they produced.

In terms of topic selection, language use was the most frequently occurring macro-topic for all students, although the advanced group selected lexis and the macro-topic of content much more frequently, and syntax much less frequently, than did the intermediate group, while the latter focused predominantly on language use, particularly morpho-syntactic concerns. It should also be noted that, although fewer sequences focusing on the topic of content occurred overall, there was a clear tendency for the MSL to be greater in sequences concentrating on content as compared with those concentrating on language use. Within the topic of content, the students in the advanced group focused on the topics of gist and discourse organization, whereas the intermediate group predominantly focused on dual theme that led to specific lexicogrammatical solutions.

Similarly, the types of topic selected for discussion influenced the distribution of dependent and embedded exchanges. While content-related sequences tended to produce a significantly greater proportion of dependent than of embedded exchanges, language use-related sequences produced a significantly greater proportion of embedded than of dependent exchanges. Further, in agreement with these findings, the advanced group, which tended to select the topic of content much more than the intermediate group, produced a higher proportion of dependent than embedded exchanges, suggesting that the students in the advanced group tended to develop the initiated topic substantively beyond the nuclear exchange. Conversely, the intermediate group, which tended to select the topic of language use more frequently than the topic of content, produced a higher proportion of embedded than of dependent exchanges,
suggesting that more time was invested in repair negotiation than in developing the topic substantively. Thus, although the average MSL of conferences did not differ significantly between the two groups, the distribution of the bound exchanges they selected was different; this appeared to be closely related to the level of the students’ target language proficiency.

A further interesting effect of different levels of Japanese proficiency was seen in the different functions for which the embedded exchange was used by the two groups. While the advanced group used confirmation requests most frequently, the intermediate group used clarification requests to perform the conversational repair function pertaining to language-related problems most frequently.

The K1 analyses examined exchange roles, knower roles, and different types of contribution made by the interactants in all move types in the three-part exchange (Initiation-Response-Follow-up). This three-dimensional analysis highlighted the complex nature of the conference interactions. It was found that although the teacher was the dominant initiator in nuclear and dependent exchanges, this did not preclude the students from contributing as K1. In fact, the students took on the role of K1 more frequently than the teacher and made substantive contributions in the role of respondent. The students’ agentive participation was particularly noticeable when the exchange focused on the intended meaning of the text, regardless of topic field, but more so in the topics of content and dual theme.

These findings suggest that the teacher and students contributed differentially to the discourse. On the one hand, the teacher managed the discourse by frequently initiating nuclear and dependent exchanges, assigning a substantive discourse role to the students, and providing feedback where appropriate. On the other hand, the students contributed as K1 by giving substantive response to the teacher’s initiation, particularly when it was related to the text intention. However, there were differences between the two proficiency groups in the extent to which they participated in such exchanges. Increased Japanese proficiency appeared to enable students to make use of a wider range of options in the discourse repertoire. There was a range of choices that the teacher could make in proposing different roles to the students. In the current study, the teacher chose to cast the students in the role of K1 respondent with an expectation for a substantive contribution. To give one example, the teacher infrequently initiated with a Demand move as K1—a move that initiates the traditional I-R-E patterns of “triadic dialogue”. Instead, she initiated with a Demand move in the role of K2, soliciting substantive responses from the students in the K1 role. The diverging participation patterns between the teacher and the students are not unexpected, of course, and seem to be a reflection of two factors: (a) the inequality between the teacher and the students in terms of status and expertise in the target language; and (b) the teacher’s responsibility as a pedagogical facilitator or manager.
In sum, by carrying out analyses at different levels in the hierarchy of discourse units, the current study has thrown new light on the complex interplay of factors that contribute to conference interactions. It has also shown that, in accounting for the different patterns of students' participation, a significant role is played by their proficiency in the target language. The main findings can be summarized as follows:

**With regard to the students: group difference**

1. The students' proficiency in the target language prompted them to select revision goals closely related to their proficiency level (intermediate vs. advanced);

2. Differences in revision goals were a major determinant of their topic selection in the conference sequences;

3. The topics selected, in turn, led the students in the two groups to participate in different ways (e.g., evidenced in the distribution of the bound exchanges selected, the extent to which they became K1, the nature of contributions made in the role of K1, and the way in which they used embedded exchanges for conversational repair);

4. To a considerable degree, increased target language proficiency appeared to impact the extent to which they could be agentive (e.g., more frequent use of Give moves in initiating the exchange to control the flow of the discourse; more frequent selection of topics that positioned themselves as K1; more frequent occasions to act as equal conversational partners with the teacher in the quantity of utterances produced);

**With regard to the teacher**

5. In the role of K1, the teacher's mode of interaction with the two proficiency-based groups differed. There was a tendency for the teacher to make Initiate Demand moves more frequently to the intermediate group and to make Response, Confirmatory Give moves to the advanced group. The distribution of topics selected by the two groups resulted in the teacher assuming the role of K1 much more frequently with the intermediate group;

6. This was largely attributable to the students' proficiency in the target language, which had an effect on the dimensions described above;

7. Nevertheless, in several significant respects, the teacher did not interact with the two groups differently. When initiating as K1, the teacher used "known-information" questions in only a small proportion of sequences, primarily in language-use related sequences. The majority of her initiation moves were made in the role of K2, inviting the students to make Response, Substantive Give moves;

**With regard to the teacher and the students**

8. Despite a high proportion of teacher initiation in nuclear and dependent exchanges, in embedded exchanges, by contrast, it was the students who initiated more frequently than the teacher;

9. Considering the role of K1 both in initiating and responding, this was taken up more
frequently by the students than the teacher; and

1. In the teacher-students distribution in K1 contributions, the choice of topic was the major determining factor (i.e., content/dual theme vs. language-use).

4.3. Writing Performance: Findings for Research Question 2

This section reports the results for research question 2: How do conferences contribute to students' subsequent revisions? The research question was broken down into two parts: (a) What was the nature of the revisions made?; and (b) What relationships could be observed between the discourse in conferences and the students' revisions in the subsequent drafts.

Before presenting findings related to each of these subquestions, I will report on the length of the students' compositions and assessments of their writing then on the rating of their revisions.

4.3.1. Length of Participants' Compositions

As shown in Table 4.16, the length of the students' compositions varied across tasks. However, a comparison of length between first and final versions indicated that although some individual final versions decreased in number of characters, there was an overall increase in the length of final versions across the three tasks. Among the three tasks, the second task prompted the students to produce much longer essays than the first and the third task did. The largest increase in number of characters from first draft to final version occurred in the second task, an average increase of 64.89 characters per composition, compared with an average increase of 55.33 characters for the first task and 55.89 characters for the second task.

The change in length from first to final versions ranged from -6 to +275 characters across students. However, six of the nine students consistently wrote more in the final version for all the tasks. In terms of overall length of essays, four students, Keith, Clive, Chris, and Cary, wrote consistently shorter essays in first draft and final versions for all the tasks than the mean for the group. The remaining five students wrote considerably longer essays than the mean in both versions, although there were some exceptions (i.e., June task 1, Ewan task 1). Edward, in particular, not only wrote long essays in draft versions, but added a substantial number of characters from first draft to final version (an increase of 275 characters for task 1, 235 characters for task 2, and 224 characters for task 3).
Table 4.16. Number of Characters in First and Final Drafts of 3 Writing Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Task 1 First Draft</th>
<th>Task 1 Final Draft</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Task 2 First Draft</th>
<th>Task 2 Final Draft</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Task 3 First Draft</th>
<th>Task 3 Final Draft</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>+222</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>+181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>-134</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>+275</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>+235</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>+224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>+70</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>+55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>+88</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>+39</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>+89</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>+38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>+41</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>5986</td>
<td>6484</td>
<td>+498</td>
<td>7394</td>
<td>7897</td>
<td>+503</td>
<td>6041</td>
<td>6623</td>
<td>+584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>665.11</td>
<td>720.44</td>
<td>+55.33</td>
<td>821.55</td>
<td>877.44</td>
<td>+55.89</td>
<td>671.22</td>
<td>736.11</td>
<td>+64.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that there was no control over time on the three compositions. They were all take-home essays that students wrote outside of class in their own spare time. In other words, they could spend as much or as little time as they were willing to set aside for the writing at a given time in the semester. The retrospective interviews with the students revealed that time available for writing essays seemed to influence the length of essays. Whereas the majority of students spent more time on the second task because of a one-week study break, they spent less time on the first and third tasks due to competing demands of various other courses they were taking (e.g., term tests, essays). The students remarked that they were particularly pressed for time when they composed the third task, since it was close to the end of the semester. Another possible factor that may have contributed to the variability in length of essays, as the students stated in the interview, was the level of interest. Most students remarked that they had more opinions to express on the second topic, effectiveness of lectures, since it related to their everyday lives as students and it was something that they had recently thought about. In sum, in the light of students’ comments given in the interviews, it may be inferred that external factors, such as time available for writing and the level of interest in the selected topics, exerted some influence on the length of the essays.

4.3.2. Writing Scores

A total of 54 essays were rated by the three external raters, using a 6-point band scale modified from Hamp-Lyons' (1991) 9-point band scale. Combining the three raters' scores, the extent to which the students improved their texts through revision was calculated by
applying a paired $t$-test to first and final draft scores on each writing task for each writing trait. Although I calculated the improvement for each writing trait from first to final drafts, I did not include overall improvement across the three tasks over the period of the study in this analysis. When all three tasks were combined, there was a clear tendency for final drafts to be better in all the five components. With the exception of discourse organization in task 3 and argumentation in tasks 1 and 3, improvement from first to final drafts was evident to a statistically significant extent. Table 4.17 presents the results of the $t$-test for all students and tasks. As a result of combining all the raters’ scores for each component, the maximum score was 18 instead of 6.

Corresponding to the wide range of the students’ Japanese proficiency from *Intermediate-low* to *Superior*, standard deviations ranged from 1.8 to 4.03. On the whole, the two components, linguistic accuracy and appropriacy, had a narrower range of standard deviations than the other three components. Common to all writing traits and tasks was the tendency for standard deviations to be smaller in the final drafts than in the first drafts.

Additionally, in a pair-wise comparison evaluation, each rater made qualitative judgements on the pairs of texts written by each writer for each task (a total of 27 pairs). Without knowledge of which draft was first or last, they assessed which text was of better quality and provided reasons for their decisions. On 80 out of 81 (98.7%) judgements, the three raters agreed with each other and also judged final drafts superior to first drafts.

The three raters agreed in terms of reasons that they gave as the basis for their judgements 95.1%, although in some cases they were slightly differently phrased. In only 4 instances out of 81 their comments diverged. For three of these cases, although the three raters noted improvement in language use, it was only one rater who also mentioned improvement in content or organization. There was one case in which one rater judged one set of writing in a diametrically opposed way to the other two raters in terms of argumentation and organization. In general, the raters’ comments suggest, not surprisingly, that local-level improvement in language use affected their overall rating. For instance, one of the comments read: “X has more adequate and accurate wordings, which makes it easier to understand the writer’s intended argument”.

---

37I adjusted the alpha level using Bonferroni $t$ to decrease the occurrences of type-1 error. An alternative may be the use of a post hoc multiple comparison test.
Table 4.17. Changes in Writing Scores from First to Final Drafts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>5 Writing Traits</th>
<th>Mean Scores (Maximum=18)</th>
<th>Paried Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Draft  SD  Final Draft  SD</td>
<td>M      SD  T value  DF  Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communicative Quality</td>
<td>12.44  4.03  14.22  3.38</td>
<td>1.778  1.09  4.88  8  .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse Organization</td>
<td>12.00  3.54  13.78  3.23</td>
<td>1.78  1.30  4.10  8  .003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>11.44  4.00  12.44  3.13</td>
<td>1.00  1.58  1.90  8  .094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Accuracy</td>
<td>10.67  2.83  13.22  2.22</td>
<td>2.56  1.24  6.20  8  .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Appropriacy</td>
<td>13.44  2.07  14.33  2.12</td>
<td>.89  .60  4.44  8  .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communicative Quality</td>
<td>11.56  3.40  13.89  2.67</td>
<td>2.33  2.00  3.50  8  .008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse Organization</td>
<td>10.89  2.93  12.89  1.90</td>
<td>2.00  1.80  3.33  8  .010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>10.89  2.47  12.56  2.65</td>
<td>1.67  1.58  3.16  8  .013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Accuracy</td>
<td>11.56  2.97  12.44  2.65</td>
<td>.89  1.05  2.53  8  .035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Appropriacy</td>
<td>12.67  2.83  14.00  1.80</td>
<td>1.33  1.12  3.58  8  .007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communicative Quality</td>
<td>11.56  3.65  14.11  2.09</td>
<td>2.56  2.35  3.26  8  .012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse Organization</td>
<td>12.22  2.59  13.00  2.83</td>
<td>.78  1.48  1.58  8  .154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>12.00  2.83  12.56  2.72</td>
<td>.56  1.59  1.05  8  .325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Accuracy</td>
<td>11.00  2.74  13.00  2.00</td>
<td>2.00  1.22  4.90  8  .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Appropriacy</td>
<td>11.78  2.28  13.33  1.87</td>
<td>1.56  1.13  4.13  8  .003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores and differences in paired scores are means for the students as a whole.

4.3.3. Revision Ratings: Findings for Research Question 2A

The nature of revisions made in the students' texts was examined on two dimensions: scope and type. For the scope of revision, the three linguistic levels were: within group/phrase, within sentence, and beyond sentence. The beyond sentence level revisions were classified into three subcategories: Addition/deletion, rearrangement, and macro-level (paragraph as a unit). With regard to types, revisions were classified according to five categories: Lexis, morpho-syntax, rewriting, textual effectiveness, and content/discourse organization.

To recap briefly, in classifying the types of revision, when the original passage had no obvious lexico-grammatical errors, revisions in the category of rewriting were double-coded either as textual effectiveness or content/discourse organization. Rewriting concerned with fixing lexico-grammatical errors was not double-coded. Due to this procedure, 866 tokens were identified for type of revision, despite the fact that there were only 837 changes in the corpus as a whole.

4.3.3.1. scope of revision. As a first step, I analyzed the scope of revision in order to discover whether there was a general pattern in the writing samples (see Table 4.18). The results show that, for both groups, the majority of revisions were made at the level of group/phrase (79.24% for the advanced group; 92% for the intermediate group). However, the proportion of
'beyond sentence' level revisions was substantially higher for the advanced (14.81%) than for the intermediate group (3.54%). With the difference being most marked in the 'addition/deletion' of sentences category. Although the mean number of revisions made was higher for the intermediate (102.6) than for the advanced group (81), this seems to have been the result of the scope of the linguistic units on which the two groups tended to concentrate. A Chi-square test, carried out on raw counts of tokens of revision, tallied according to the two groups and the categories for scope of revision, showed a significant difference between the two groups: \( \chi^2(4, N = 10) = 37.84, p < .001 \).

**Table 4.18. Scope of Revision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group/phrase</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Beyond Sentence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addition/Deletion</td>
<td>Rearrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>259 (79.94)</td>
<td>17 (5.25)</td>
<td>30 (9.26)</td>
<td>13 (4.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>472 (92.00)</td>
<td>23 (4.48)</td>
<td>8 (1.60)</td>
<td>9 (1.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>731 (87.34)</td>
<td>40 (4.78)</td>
<td>38 (4.54)</td>
<td>22 (2.63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Raw counts for tokens of revision appear in regular type face; percentages appear in parentheses.

4.3.3.2. **type of revision.** The first analysis indicated that both groups of students made the majority of their revisions at the level of group/phrase. However, as reported in Table 4.19, an analysis of types of revision revealed a significant difference between the two groups in the types of revision they concentrated on: \( \chi^2(4, N = 10) = 199.67, p < .001 \). The advanced group made a markedly higher proportion of revisions concerned with textual effectiveness and content/discourse organization (58.3%) and a much lower proportion of syntactic revisions (12.54%). For the intermediate group, the difference was also substantial but in a diametrically opposed way. Lexical and syntactic revisions were dominant (80.49%), whereas revisions in textual effectiveness and content/discourse organization occurred with much lower frequency (15.68%). Thus, although both groups made revisions at the level of group/phrase, the types of revision they made were qualitatively different. Whereas the advanced group focused on textual effectiveness, lexis, and content/discourse organization in their revisions, the intermediate group was more focused on lexicogrammatical revisions.
Table 4.19. Type of Revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Lexis</th>
<th>Morphosyntax</th>
<th>Rewriting</th>
<th>Textual Effectiveness</th>
<th>Content/Disc Org</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>78 (22.74)</td>
<td>.43 (12.54)</td>
<td>22 (6.41)</td>
<td>145 (42.27)</td>
<td>55 (16.03)</td>
<td>343 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>178 (34.03)</td>
<td>243 (46.46)</td>
<td>20 (3.82)</td>
<td>59 (11.28)</td>
<td>23 (4.40)</td>
<td>523 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>256 (29.56)</td>
<td>286 (33.03)</td>
<td>42 (4.85)</td>
<td>204 (23.56)</td>
<td>78 (9.00)</td>
<td>866 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Raw counts for tokens of revision appear in regular type face; percentages appear in parentheses. Dis Org = discourse organization

4.3.4. The Link between Conference and Revision: Findings for Research Question 2B

This section reports the results for research question 2B: What relationships could be observed between the discourse in conferences and students' revisions in the subsequent drafts? As was noted previously, dividing the main question into 6 subquestions, I conducted 6 subanalyses. In reporting the results of these analyses, for each subquestion, I will first present the results for the sample as a whole and then compare the results of the intermediate and advanced groups (see Table 4.20).

4.3.4.1. overall results. The first analysis (from sequences to revision) pointed to some commonalities. For all students, a high proportion of sequences led to revisions (90.4%), and no difference appeared between the two groups (91.9% for the intermediate; 87.7% for the advanced). For sequences that led to revisions, the number of revisions occurring on average per sequence was 1.76 for students as a whole; this was comparable between the two groups (1.76 for the intermediate and 1.75 for the advanced). However, some group differences emerged in the analysis of the third subquestion. In those sequences where the link to revision was not traced (8.1% for the intermediate and 12.3% for the advanced), the proportion of sequences where the discussion of potential revisions could have led to revisions was 67.4% for the whole group. However, it was much higher for the intermediate (84%) than for the advanced group (47.6%).

In the second analysis (from revisions to sequences), more salient differences between the two groups emerged. For all students, the proportion of revisions linked to conference sequences was 90.7%. However, while 96.9% of the revisions made by the intermediate group could be traced back to conference sequences, the proportion of correspondence dropped to 80.9% for the advanced group. This implies that the advanced students were able to make more revisions independently, beyond what was made available in the conference talk.

4.3.4.2. results pertaining to group difference. The results for sub-question 5 revealed that for those revisions linked to conference sequences, the nature of correspondence
was qualitatively different between the two groups. To briefly recap the six micro-categories of correspondence used for analysis, three concerned “one-to-one correspondence” where explicit discussion of lexico-grammar in the conference led to revision in one-to-one fashion: (a) incorporated into the writing, although displaying some inaccuracies; (b) incorporated into the writing verbatim; and (c) incorporated into the writing successfully but with some modifications. The remaining three micro-categories were more general in nature: (a) linguistic model provided by the teacher; (b) extrapolated from one example; and (c) general discussion leading to substantive revision.

For all students, the proportion of revisions in the category of explicit discussion leading to revisions in one-to-one correspondence was substantially higher than that of revisions of a general nature (84.6% vs 15.4%). The primary forms of correspondence found in the intermediate group were those of one-to-one correspondence (93.6%). By contrast, a wider range of correspondence was found in the advanced group, that is to say, a combination of one-to-one and general types of correspondence: verbatim correspondence, successful revisions with some modification, extrapolation from one example, and general discussion leading to substantive revision. Despite the difference between the groups, the micro-category b (verbatim correspondence) occurred most frequently for all students (75.1%), but more frequently for the intermediate than for the advanced group (84.7% vs. 57.3%).

To verify my general impression, I then collapsed the six micro-categories into two major ones and conducted a Chi-Square test. A significant difference was found between the intermediate and the advanced group: \( \chi^2(1, N = 4) = 90.87, p < .001 \). The occurrence of the categories b and f (one-to-one verbatim correspondence; general discussion leading to substantive revision) contributed to the difference. To identify the major contributing factor, I then carried out a Chi-Square test on these two micro-categories b and f: \( \chi^2(1, N = 4) = 108.48, p < .001 \). Inspection revealed that the category of general discussion leading to substantive revision was the largest contributing factor to the difference between the groups.
Table 4.20. Results of Correspondence Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of comparison</th>
<th>All revisions</th>
<th>Revisions -link</th>
<th>Revisions +link</th>
<th>Categories of correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One-to-one correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>759 (100)</td>
<td>33 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>642 (84.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate group</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>497 (100)</td>
<td>26 (5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>465 (93.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced group</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>262 (100)</td>
<td>7 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>177 (67.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Raw frequencies appear in regular type; percentages appear in parentheses. [One-to-one correspondence] a = incorporated into the writing, although displaying some inaccuracies; b = incorporated into the writing verbatim; c = incorporated into the writing successfully but with some modifications [Correspondence of general nature] d = linguistic model provided by the teacher; e = extrapolated from one example; f = general discussion leading to substantive revision.

Finally, having extracted the unlinked revisions (out of all the revisions made, 3.1% for the intermediate group; 19.1% for the advanced group), I examined the types of revisions made. To see the general pattern, I combined preexisting categories and created the category for two major revision types, namely, language use and content. As is shown in Table 4.21, of the unlinked revisions made by all students, 20.5% concerned language use and 79.5% concerned content. Of the unlinked revisions made by the intermediate group, 46.3% were related to language use and 53.7% to content. By contrast, the unlinked revisions made by the advanced group were predominantly related to content (88.7%); a high proportion of these revisions fell into the category of textual effectiveness (62.8%). A Chi-Square test conducted on the two major revision types showed a significant difference between the groups, to which the cells for content made the most substantial contribution: $X^2(1, N = 8) = 8.88, p < .001$.

Table 4.21. Types of unlinked revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision types</th>
<th>Language use</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lexis</td>
<td>Morpho-syntax</td>
<td>Textual effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>9 (11.5)</td>
<td>7 (9.0)</td>
<td>49 (62.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>3 (8.8)</td>
<td>6 (37.5)</td>
<td>7 (43.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>6 (9.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td>42 (67.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Raw frequencies appear in regular type; percentages appear in parentheses.
4.3.5. Summary of Findings for Research Question 2: How did the teacher-student conferences contribute to students’ subsequent revisions?

2A) What was the nature of the revisions made?

Although, in terms of scope, all students made the majority of revisions at the level of group/phrase, the proportion of ‘beyond sentence’ level revisions was substantially higher for the advanced group than for the intermediate group. Further analysis of the types of revision revealed a significant difference between the two proficiency-based groups. Compared with the intermediate group, the advanced group produced a markedly higher proportion of meaning-related revisions, involving rewriting, textual effectiveness, and content/discourse organization. By contrast, the intermediate group produced predominantly form-related revisions related to linguistic accuracy. With respect to form-related revisions, while the advanced group was more concerned with lexis than with morpho-syntax, this pattern was reversed for the intermediate group. In fact, nearly half of the revisions made by the intermediate group were morpho-syntactical. Thus, although the two groups made most revisions at the level of group/phrase, the types of revision on which they focused were qualitatively different.

2B) What relationships could be observed between the discourse in conferences and students’ revisions in their subsequent drafts?

The link between the conference discourse and revisions in the students’ final drafts was examined through a bidirectional analysis, from sequences to revisions (analysis 1) and from revisions to sequences (analysis 2). The three most important findings from the first analysis were as follows. First, a high proportion of sequences in the conference discourse led to revisions for all students’ writing. Second, for sequences that led to revisions, the average number of revisions occurring per sequence did not differ between the two proficiency-groups. Third, of sequences without a link to revisions, the proportion of sequences where potential revisions were discussed without any uptake in terms of revisions to their compositions was much higher for the intermediate than for the advanced group.

Further, the second analysis pointed to salient differences between the two groups. First, of all the revisions linked to the conference discourse: While most of the revisions made by the intermediate group could be traced to conferences sequences, the revisions corresponding to conference sequences was significantly lower for the advanced group. Second, of all the revisions linked to the conference discourse, the primary form of
correspondence found in the intermediate group was revisions that implemented conference suggestions in a verbatim fashion. By contrast, a wider range of relationships was found in the advanced group. The difference was most pronounced in the category of 'general discussion leading to substantive revision,' in that its occurrence was significantly greater for the advanced than for the intermediate group. Finally, of the revisions occurring without conference talk, while the revisions made by the intermediate group were distributed almost equally between language use (lexis and morphosyntax) and content (textual effectiveness and content/discourse organization), those made by the advanced group were predominantly concerned with content.

In sum, the students in the two proficiency-based groups utilized the majority of specific pointers offered during the conference negotiation to revise their first drafts. This being said, the ways in which they revised were qualitatively different, perhaps reflecting the types of topic selected for discussion in the conferences in the light of the students’ revision goals and their Japanese proficiency.
CHAPTER 5: CASE STUDIES

The previous chapter reported general patterns observed in the data pertaining to the first two research questions addressed in the study. In addition, I showed how these patterns differed in certain important respects when the advanced students were compared as a group with those with only intermediate proficiency; the most salient variable foreshadowing the students’ performance in the writing activity was their proficiency in Japanese. While in Chapter 4 the students’ engagement in the writing activity was described in terms of quantitative analyses of the outcomes of their performance, in this chapter, the analytic approach adopted is qualitative in nature. Initially, I envisaged that in writing case studies, I would focus on the first and second research questions. However, when I came to conduct the case-study analyses, it became clear that by doing so I would not be doing justice to the complex factors affecting the students’ modes of engagement with the writing tasks. Consequently, this chapter not only follows up on the findings of Chapter 4 but also inquires into the extent to which the students’ engagement with the writing activity was explicable in terms of their differential proficiency in the target language and into other factors that may cut across the proficiency difference (research question 3). Thus, this chapter explores the students’ differential performance in the light of all the data available, including the transcripts of retrospective interviews that provide evidence for how the students undertook and felt about different tasks and composing in Japanese.

Chapter 5 consists of three sections. First, to contextualize subsequent analyses, I start with a brief description of the students’ general attitudes to and perceptions of JFL writing. Second, through mini-case studies of the five selected students, I attempt to portray the complexity underlying the students’ differential performance and salient features of their modes of engagement with the writing tasks. Drawing on all the data collected for each student, I examine their task engagement in and with the writing activity. Then, in the third section, shifting my focus back to the whole sample, I make additional observations concerning the three particular situational factors identified in the case studies. Finally, to conclude this chapter, I report the extent to which the students’ performance appeared to be explicable in terms of their differential Japanese proficiency, and outline other variables that may have affected their performance.
5.1. Students’ Perceptions of JFL Writing

The analyses of the interview data revealed that the students had similar perceptions of JFL writing. The manner in which JFL learning fit in the students’ life trajectories appeared to shape their conceptualization of JFL writing in a fundamental way. Along with their interests in Japanese culture and language, they also had a distinctly utilitarian view of FL learning. They regarded Japanese as a tool or an additional linguistic resource that would enable them to pursue their prospective careers or larger goals in life. For instance, Edward wanted to master Japanese so as to pursue an international M.B.A. degree, whereas Clive’s motivation was to obtain a job in a Japanese company in Taiwan. Hence, for most of the students, FL learning meant the development of the language facility to function appropriately within the parameters of a specific language code (Cumming, 1989, p.124).

The nature of the JFL writing assignments also influenced the way the students approached them. They tended to characterize JFL essays as, short, opinion-based, and requiring little research-based validation. Equally fundamental to the shaping of their views of JFL writing was the fact that they were writing in a FL, in which many of them had not yet developed sufficient automaticity in manipulating grammar and vocabulary to produce a spontaneous linguistic stream in the language. As a result, they tended to perceive JFL writing to be time-consuming and sometimes frustrating, as they constantly needed to consult various dictionaries and grammar books while composing their texts.

5.2. Case Studies

The analyses in Chapter 4 have not conveyed the diversity within each group and across individuals. To develop fuller understanding of their situated practice, I now turn to case studies and examine the way in which the three-part activity—writing, conferences, and revision—unfolded for individual students. I selected five students for case studies by a process of purposive sampling so as to make meaningful comparisons across cases and to have representative cases in relation to the key points on the dimension of biliteracy. First, I chose students who were very confident in their abilities as writers of prose in their dominant language of literacy, as was evidenced in their responses in the questionnaire and interview data. Second, in order to illustrate variability within the two groups, I selected a pair from each proficiency-based group (intermediate and advanced) who shared some characteristics, but differed in others. For the advanced group, I selected Edward and Jim on the grounds that they were both born and educated in Canada and had English as their “primary language” (Stern, 1983).
They felt most comfortable with English, but differed with respect to the language(s) used at home. To represent the intermediate group, I selected Chris and Clive because although they shared the same L1 and similar life trajectories (Table 4.1), they demonstrated distinctly different approaches towards writing in Japanese; while Clive adopted an experience-based, personalized approach to composing in Japanese, Chris opted for arguing from a general point of view rather than his own experience. In addition, I chose Ewan as a pivotal case between these two pairs in that he was more like Edward and Jim in terms of his primary language and medium of education, but more like Chris and Clive in terms of his Japanese language proficiency.

The analyses draw on the same set of data for each student: (a) conference talk and the students’ first and final drafts; (b) retrospective interviews and questionnaire results; and (c) field notes written by David and myself. The length of my acquaintance with these students varied from one to four years. I had known Ewan over four academic years in four different course contexts and Chris and Clive over two academic years in three different classes. My acquaintance with Jim and Edward was over one academic year in the course in which I conducted my dissertation research. However, because both of them tended to be talkative, both in Japanese and English, I felt that I came to know them sufficiently well.

In presenting these case studies, I adopt a distinctly different voice to give the central place to each case-study student. To this end, instead of using ‘I’, I distance myself from the narrative by referring to myself in third person as ‘the teacher’. Against this background of a shift in tone, the five vignettes are reported in the following sequence. I start with a description of the pair from the advanced group, then of Ewan as a transitional case, and finally of the pair from the intermediate group. When reporting each case study, I first sketch out a brief profile of each student, weaving together into my narrative what I consider to be characteristic traits of each individual, their ontogenetic trajectories, and their revision goals. I then highlight key aspects of the students’ oral interaction in the conference, the types of revision made, and the students’ perspectives voiced in the interviews. In so doing, I also consider each individual in the light of the findings reported in Chapter 4, i.e., the behaviors associated with the two proficiency-based groups.

5.2.1. Edward

Edward was born to English-speaking parents and raised in Ontario. He had been educated in English and his exposure to L2 was limited to core French classes at school. However, when he was selected as a high school exchange student to Japan, an entirely different
L2 learning experience presented itself. Unlike in his core French classes, he learned Japanese in a sink-or-swim fashion through his one-year immersion in a Japanese high school. He lived with a monolingual Japanese family and attended Grade 12 classes in which his classmates hardly spoke any English. Since he spoke very little Japanese, he was given one-on-one JSL pull-out lessons for a few hours each day and spent the rest of the day in regular classrooms. Being an athlete, he actively participated in extra-curricular activities, made friends, and quickly became fluent in spoken Japanese. Upon his return to Canada, he continued his Japanese language study with a private tutor for two years and became able to read Japanese newspapers with ease. At the university, he was placed directly in senior-level Japanese courses after being assessed as an advanced learner.

Edward exuded self-confidence. He was very articulate and hard-working. Despite his heavy course load, he managed to make time to work at a political office in the university and also worked part-time at a bank. The adjective “energetic” would most aptly capture Edward’s vitality in everything he engaged in. He tackled learning Japanese with the same intensity and vigor. On a daily basis, he extensively read Japanese newspapers and books on investment outside the Japanese class and was even translating an academic article from Japanese to English upon a request from one of his professors. According to Edward, all this multi-tasking was “fun”.

5.2.1.1. modification of revision goals. Not surprisingly, Edward took a similar approach to composing a Japanese essay. As he put it, “I was expecting to enjoy myself writing these [compositions]”. At the beginning of the semester, when asked to set up two revision goals, involving one micro- and one macro-goal, he set out to focus particularly on a micro-goal (language use), that is to say, improvement in the use of mimetic words, idiomatic expressions, and proverbs. At the outset of the first conference, he suggested that the teacher should lead the discussion, since he wrote his first draft as best as he could within the limit of his current Japanese abilities and was satisfied with the product. He was clear about what he wanted to work on in his Japanese writing and how he wanted the conference to proceed.

However, notwithstanding his declared goal, much to his surprise, he found himself focusing on clear expressions of his ideas in his text revision. He recounted this unexpected turn of events to David:

[In terms of revising the first draft of the first writing task] I made a few organizational changes on my own... and that's not really a language thing, it's more of an essay writing thing, so...I think I made my essay a lot more clear, and um, I think it made it more clear to the reader what exactly I was trying to say, and before I was a little presumptuous that they [readers] would understand exactly what I was saying...so I think she [the teacher] really helped out in that sense, that was good, yeah...but I thought her structural, I mean that the conference, I don't know if it was actually her, but the conference itself allowed me to improve my structure.

(First Interview, 2/4/98)
In the same interview session, Edward noted that he was somewhat taken back by the fact that his teacher had difficulty in understanding his first draft. Interestingly, Edward’s fledgling interest in the clear presentation of his ideas and the coherence of his prose, as was reported in the first interview, became his primary concern and focus of attention in his second and third compositions:

...my aims were just to write a very clear essay, and uh, hopefully that came across this time...The second time...I was very conscious of my structure, even though that’s something I didn’t highlight that I was interested in a little more, um, I think it’s because I had such a solid argument. I wanted to get across that it was very important for me to make this essay clear, as opposed, like before I was talking about I wanted to learn more about gitaigo, kanyogo, kotowaza [mimetic words, idiomatic expressions, and proverbs] and stuff like that, but with this one, it was more um, I wanted to make my point very very clear, to whom I was speaking, I wasn’t worried about the micro, uh, issues, I was more worried about the macro issues of how my structure was set up, and I paid really really close attention to what I was- what I was saying to the person- what I was saying to my audience, at what time, and whether I was conveying a consistent message. (Second Interview 3/2/98)

My aim is always to be understood and you know...even though it pains me when I'm not understood, it's good to know that there's things to work out better. My aim was...you know...present your ideas and get the other person to understand it and my aim was also to kind of beat the other essay in terms of clarity and strong argument and yeah...I don't know if I necessarily beat it but I think I matched the last essay I wrote ...this is quite clear...I think I met my aims and expectations for this one. (Third Interview 4/2/98)

5.2.1.2. excerpt 1: clarifying and developing ideas through talk. To give a flavor of how Edward discussed his first drafts with the teacher, one sequence taken from the second conference is presented. The focus in the sequence was gist, particularly the connection between the first two paragraphs. As is exemplified in this sequence, Edward was an equal conversational partner with the teacher throughout all the conference interactions. Some of the discursive features identified in Chapter 4 as characteristics of the students with advanced proficiency are easily recognizable in the following excerpt: In turn 85, the teacher initiates the sequence by asking Edward to clarify how the beginning of the second paragraph related to the first. Prompted by the teacher’s questions in turns 85 and 87, he explains his intended meanings in turns 86 and 88. Then, in turn 94, he points out that he may not have written what he meant to say fully, and in turns 96, 98, and 100, he initiates a dependent exchange and goes on to further elaborate on his text intention.
Task 2, Sequence 7, Gist

85 T: Ano... Dainidanraku no hajime to daiichidanraku ga doo tsunagatte iru no ka chotto setsuneeshite moraemasu ka? Tsunagari ga chotto yoku wakaranakatta node (Um... Can you talk a bit about how the beginning of the second paragraph relates to the first paragraph? The link between the two is not all that obvious to me)

86 S: Demo ano aru jyugwoo de wa. ano- koogi o tanoshimu koto ga dekinai to watashi wa omoimasu (um well you see in some classes, I don’t think students can enjoy lectures)

87 T: A. soo desu ka? (Oh, really?)

88 S: Jyooohoo ga annari ni mo ookute ano- kichinto nooto o kakanai a. to ..<seikoo> dekinai. Dakara futatsu no koto shinakereba naranai. Dakara hitotsu wa ano- daigaku wa curriculum o chotto kaeta hoo ga ii, dakara ano kokoni kaita kedo ano- ...hitsujuoo na jyooohoo wa zenbu kyoukasho ni kaitte aru kara, jibun de benkyoo dekiru. Demo omona point wa koogi de ano- ma discussion mitainai kanji de shita hoo ga ii desu ne. De. ano- ...sono ano ippo? Gakusei wa ano- ano, ano kono jyugwoo tanoshii tanoshimu to you kangaetate koto ga de class ni itta hoo ga ii to omoimasu (When there is too much information given, um, students have to take notes diligently, um, otherwise they cannot succeed. So they have to do two things at once [listening to a lecture while constantly taking notes]. So, for one thing, universities should change their curriculum, so um as I wrote here um students can study the necessary information in the textbooks by themselves. But important points in the textbooks, um, should be dealt with in the lecture through discussion. um,... Well, um, on the other hand? Students would be better off if they go to a class thinking they should enjoy it)

89 T: A, taikutsuda tte omowanakutto? (Ah, you mean not going into lectures, thinking they are boring?)

90 S: Soo desu. Hai (Yes, that’s right.)

91 T: Naruhodone. Eeto, ano, dakara, zenmenteki ni sono koogi tte yuu no wa iiite yutte iru wakemyonakute, iro. nanka koogi demo mondaiten ga aru n da keredomo jissai koogi tte yuu katachi ni natte irukara soreenara tanoshinde itte, riyou dekiru koto wa riyouishiia hoo ga ii tte yuukoto desu yo ne (I see, Um, so, you are not saying unilaterally that lectures are good, but you are saying although lectures have their drawbacks, since you have to attend them, you might as well enjoy and take advantage of them, right?).

92 S: Hai, demo (Yes, but)

93 T: Un (Yes)

94 S: Sore wa saishuuuteki ni kaita ka doo ka wakaranai (In the end, I don’t know whether I wrote that in my text)

95 T: Sore wa ano- kaite nai desu ne (Um it’s not spelled out in your written text)

96 S: A. n, demo ano- nani o kaita kana? Ano- un. Ma, sono shigoto girai wa onaji yoono mono desu ne. Dakara ano-..... ano- annari chigai sekai to watashi wa omowanai. Dakara ironna hito wa gakkoo wa taikutsu da kedo ano- shigoto wa **** shigoto wa jibun no shigotoba wa jibun no gakkoo to
In his final draft, Edward inserted three sentences at the beginning of the second paragraph, incorporating what he had told the teacher in this sequence. As a result, the transition from the first to the second paragraph became easier to follow. The relevant segments of the first and final drafts, the English translation of Japanese texts, are presented in Table 5.1. As is exemplified in this revision, Edward tended to rework his text globally, based on the conference discussion concerning his text intention.

**Table 5.1. An Example of Edward's Revision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First paragraph</th>
<th>Second paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First draft</strong></td>
<td>I think that loathing toward one's own job is a big social problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not surprising that many people find lectures boring. However, lectures that are used effectively can be an enjoyable means of studying and be helpful in preparing for one's future work.</td>
<td><strong>However, in some classes, in order to teach a great deal of information, the tendency is to pack students with too much information. This results in students not enjoying classes and criticizing them as boring. As they carry over the same negative attitude toward their future work, this may lead to their loathing of their own jobs.</strong> I think that loathing toward one's own job is a big social problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second draft</strong></td>
<td>(Double asterisks indicate the sentences that Edward added after the conference discussion.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recall his comment in the first interview, "I don't know if it was actually her [the
teacher], but the conference itself allowed me to improve my structure". In the second and third interviews, he seemed to have a clearer sense of how the conference talk was helping him revise his text. The next quotation captures Edward's increased awareness of the process of the conference:

"...the best thing was... the best thing really for the argument was when she [the teacher] would say "now what exactly does this mean? I don't really know exactly what you're saying"...right? ...and then I would realize ...oh, this is unclear...and I would explain it to her in verbal form and through explaining to her in verbal form I figured out what happens on paper to make it make it good so I think her identifying what was unclear to her helped big time."

(Third Interview, 4/2/98)

It was the act of explaining his intended meanings orally to the teacher that prompted him to recognize the gap between what he had meant to say and what he had actually said in his essay. He emphasized that he had appropriate content in that he had little difficulty in generating ideas and developing a strong argument. Similarly, in the conference sessions, he had little difficulty in explaining what he had wanted to say in his text in a coherent manner. What was challenging to him was fully describing his ideas in the written text, translating his thoughts into printed words with precision, and making the connection between the ideas clear. These, as it turned out, were his general problems with writing, not just when writing in Japanese. These two problems made revising a difficult task for Edward:

"...for some reason when I write something in English or Japanese, I always think it's perfect (laughs), and when I go back to revise it, I read it, it makes total sense to me, because I’ve written it, right?...And then what happens is, when someone else looks at it, you know it just happened with a recent English essay, they'll look at it, they're looking over my first draft, and there are a few things, they made a few comments, and from the comments I noticed that they had no idea what I was talking about, so then I realized "oh, maybe there's some ambiguity here, I should change this", but I never realize that on my own, I usually have to have someone point out that...I have difficulty viewing it from a different point of view from my own, because I know what I'm trying to say, so I'm reading it like, "yeah, yeah, this is good, this is good", because we're talking really well with each other, because it's me (laughs), so when someone else reads it, you know, they're reading with a different perspective...

I think that's my major problem [connecting ideas], and I think it was with the last essay too, is that um, I have all these ideas I want to get on paper, so instead of taking one idea and focusing and elaborating on it - and I have this trouble in English - I'll just try to throw all the ideas together, and I'll just figure someone who reads this will understand, all these ideas together, and then my concluding statement will be a conclusion, based on analyzing all of this data, but I haven't analyzed it all on paper, I've put it down, I've analyzed it in my head, and I put a conclusion, but no one knows how the hell I got this, this conclusion, because I analyzed it in my head, so I've gotta focus more on, you know, doing the analysis on paper, and making it clear what I'm saying."

(Second Interview 3/2/98)

Edward described his aim to be to write a clear essay so as to be understood by the reader, and he stressed that he paid conscious attention to this aspect of text production in
writing and revising. However, Japanese being a foreign language, he reported that he also paid even closer attention to language use in his text production. In response to David’s question regarding what benefits he hoped to gain through the conferencing experience, Edward gave an interesting response:

Okay...hm..well, a benefit that I thought I’d never get, um, is improved structure, I think this is helping me, with my structure, and it might even be reflected in the other essay I wrote too, because, um, in that one I maintained a consistent idea which is sometimes something I have trouble with, uh, but uh, I think I’ve been focusing mostly on the micro issues so far, and I think that’s more important to focus on, because I can learn the macro issues in English, uh, but I can’t learn the micro issues in Japanese in English classes, so, that’s why it’s just uh, that’s why I want to focus on micro issues, ‘cause I know once this class is over, no one else is going to be able to teach it to me, so (laughs) I’ve got to get as much as I can out of that, so that’s what I’m focusing, I’m not trying to say that my macro is perfect, it’s not at all, but the micro issues are something an English professor can’t talk to me about. (Second Interview 3/2/98)

5.2.1.3. excerpt 2: searching for the most suitable words. In the next excerpt, a sequence taken from the third conference, one can catch a glimpse of why micro issues were important to Edward. This sequence is an illustration of another type of gap between his Japanese language competence and cognition, namely what he termed “a language thing” in the first interview. The topic of the third assignment was the system of life-time employment and this particular sequence was categorized as dual theme.38 As shown in the following excerpt, Edward felt that life-time employment should be abolished from the viewpoint of business management, but he wanted to state it diplomatically so as not to sound too extreme. A global discussion of the intended meanings and rhetorical effects from turns 197 to 204 led the teacher to realize that one of the problems of the passage was the use of the verb uttaeru (turn 205). In turn 206, based on the preceding discussion, Edward suggests a more appropriate alternative for what he wanted to say.

Task 3, Sequence 20, Dual Theme

197 T: “Shitagatte kaishain o anshin saseru kooka wa kyuuryuu to fukurikoosei kara no setsuyaku o koenainara, akirakani kaiha mo shuushinkooyooseido haishi o uttaeru beki dearu”, ichiban saigo no bun nani ga iitai no ka yoku wakaranakatta n da kedo (“Therefore if the effect of making employees feel secure does not involve cutting the cost of salaries and benefits, clearly, companies should also appeal to abolish the life-time employment system”, Um about the last sentence [in the third paragraph] I wasn’t too sure what you were trying to say).

198 S: Aa...,koenainara [reads the passage to himself] (Well...not going beyond)

---

38To recap briefly, the topic field of dual theme is assigned to those sequences that start with a global discussion and end with a specific lexico-grammatical solution.
199 T: Jyaa, mazu "koenainara" made no tokoro o mite ikimashoo. Koko made wa nani ga itakatta no kana? (Well, let's start with the first part, up to "not going beyond" [the end of the first clause]. What were you trying to say here?)

200 S: A, dakara, kinoo jyugyou de hanashimashita ne? A- a sono dakara tabun kono shushin koyoo o haishi suruto shain ga minna nante yuu, suto o shite, sugoku waiwai sawaidari suruto tabun sono ..haishi o shinai hoo ga ii to omoimasu. Tabun ano kono shushinkoyoooseido o haishi shinai hoo ga ii to omoimasu (I mentioned about it yesterday in class, didn't I? Well, if [Japanese] companies eliminate the system of life-time employment, there may be, how shall I say it, strikes by employees... , so perhaps I think it's better not to eliminate the life-time employment system). [Edward responds to the teacher initiation in turn 197, not to her reinitiation move in the preceding turn]

201 T: Jyaa, koko de itte iru no wa, hai, shushinkoyoooseido ..wa haishi shinai hoo ga ii to itte iru n desu ka? (Ok, then, you are saying here that companies shouldn't abandon life-time employment?)

202 S: Iya, chigau (No, that's not what I meant).

203 T: Chigau? (Oh?)

204 S: Ano- kajinteki ni wa dekireba shushinkoyoooseido o haishi shita hoo ga ii to omoimasu. Shikashi ano- inano shushinkoyo o wa sugoku shain o manzoku sasete te ano- hontoni seisanseti no takasa wa shushin koyoo, koyoo no okageda kara ano shushinkyo o o no hoji shita hooga ii desu. Demo moshika shitara sonna koto wa houto jyanai to omoimasu. Dakara shushinkyo o haishi shita hoo ga ii to omoimasu. Demo watashi wa akirakani kaisha. Kaisha no shushinkoyoooseido o haishi shita hoo ga ii to yuu to sore wa tabun shiya no semai, ano koto to onowaremasu. Dakara chotto disclaimer ittai (Uh, personally I think it's better to abandon life-time employment if that's possible. But, uh, because of life-time employment, employees are content, uh, high production rate [in Japan] is to due to this system, it's better um to keep it. But, this may be an illusion. That's why I think it's better to get rid of this system. Nonetheless, if I strongly argue that companies should abandon this system, I may come across as narrow-minded. That's why I wanted to put a disclaimer).

205 T: A, dakara disclaimer no tokoro ga wakannakatta no ne, sono nante yuu no ka, "shitagatte kaishain o anshin saseru kooka wa, kyuuryou to fukuri koosei kara no setsuyaki o koenainara, .." dakara 7. sorekara yoku wakannakatta no wa kaisha ga dooshite shushin koyoooseido no haishi o uttaeru no ka dare ni uttaeru no ka ga yoku wakannai shi nande uttaeru no ka mo yoku wakannai (Ah, right, I suppose the disclaimer part was what I had difficulty grasping. [Reading the passage] Why were you saying that companies should make an appeal to abandon the life-time employment system? I'm not too clear to whom, how, and why they should appeal...)

206 S: A, uttaeru tabun uttaeru wa tekitoojyanai. Dakara keieisha wa nani mo uttaenai ne. (Ah, then, perhaps "appeal" is not an appropriate word here, since it's not the companies that appeal).

207 T: Soo desu ne (Right).

208 S: OK kaisha wa seido no haishi o ano- haishi. haishino hoo e muku beki. Fumikitta, fumikiru beki? (OK How about companies should abandon, should move toward abandoning, ventured, venture to move toward abandoning life-time employment ?)

209 T: Aa, sorenara wakarimasu (Ah, that makes sense).
As seen above, this sequence started with the discussion of the whole sentence, but eventually focused on the second clause, in particular, the use of the verb *uttaeru* (to appeal). Although Edward settled on the verb *fumikiru* in the conference, in his final draft, he instead wrote *dandan jisshi suru beki dearu* (gradually implement). In the final draft, Edward changed his wording of the second clause substantially. From "..akirakani kaisha mo shuushinkoyooseido haishi o uttaeru beki dearu" (...clearly, companies should also appeal to abolish the life-time employment system) in the first draft to "Shitagarre, keieikanri no men de wa, kaisha mo shuushinkoyooseido no haishi o dandan jisshi suru beki dearu" (In companies without a seniority system, employee’s salaries and benefits can be controlled. Therefore, to become economically efficient, companies should gradually move toward abandoning the system of life-time employment) in the final draft.

In this way, Edward made revisions addressing both global and local issues: "an essay writing thing" and "a language thing" in his words. Some of his revisions were verbatim transfer from the conference talk, such as discrete vocabulary items and morpho-syntactic accuracy. However, prominent in Edward’s revisions was consistent evidence of his independent thinking beyond the conference talk, involving a major reworking of the first draft as a whole. In revising the first two compositions, Edward reported that he had referred back to points made in the discussion in conference, one by one, starting from the beginning of the first draft and going through to the end. However, he revised the third essay, which was due at the end of the academic year, differently:

...I kind of thought no, quality took some time. This one was like I got lots of things to do...put it down...I went through the entire assignment ...what she had recommended for the small things to change...then I went back and I said okay now what are the major things I had to clarify and then I added detail...this is because that is a really semantic way of doing it and I knew it would cut down on my revision time. Like the last essay I wrote when I did the revision it took me two or three hours...this one took me about 30 minutes...45 minutes...that's because I really wanted to get it done quickly...so speed was a factor. I used the systematic approach this time and it was also because of the fact it wasn't an interesting essay. Like the last essay was like I was really passionate about writing it...this one was kind of like...got to get this done....so that was a great influence of my approach

(Third Interview, 4/2/98).

As this quotation suggests, the degree of interest in the topic and the time available affected the process of revision. Nonetheless, Edward was clearly able to look at his text as a whole, not just being glued to "small things", even when he was pressed for time. According to Edward,
making revisions in conjunction with the conference provided an opportunity for a “good review” due to the repetition involved in the write-talk-revise cycle:

it's like when you study for an exam ...you know you keep reading something over and over and until it's like...you know...I'm sick of this but it stays in your mind...but that's what this [the cycle of write-talk-revise] is all about. My revisions...the things I did wrong stay in my mind and I won't make the same mistake twice

(Third Interview, 4/2/98).

5.2.1.4. salient features of Edward’s mode of engagement. As the excerpts from the interview transcripts show, Edward’s interactional style in his mother tongue was confident, assertive, and loquacious. He was never at a loss for words. This was not necessarily the case when he interacted with the teacher in the conferences; uncharacteristically, he sometimes paused and groped for words to express himself in Japanese. However, his overall presentation of self in Japanese was parallel to his confident self in English. He seemed to overcome his linguistic constraints in Japanese by holding the conversational floor until he made his point, however many turns it took him to achieve it. In this way, he was equally loquacious in Japanese and made substantive contributions to the conference talk. As he relegated the responsibility of initiating the topic to the teacher at the beginning, it hardly comes as a surprise that he did not frequently initiate nuclear exchanges. However, once the topic was established in the nuclear exchange, he proactively initiated many dependent exchanges, leading the conversation equally with the teacher and providing elaborated responses. In the light of his conference talk, he drastically modified his revision goals from an exclusive attention to one aspect of language use to attention to clarity of meaning in overall aspects of text production. As a result, his revisions included lexico-grammatical fixing, more refined wording, and a major reworking of the text in terms of organization. However, Japanese being a foreign language to him, the benefits that he hoped to gain from this experience mainly concerned language use.

5.2.2. Jim

Jim was born to Japanese parents who were first-generation Japanese immigrants to Canada and all his schooling was in the medium of English. At home he used both Japanese and English, although English became the dominant home language after he started junior kindergarten at the local public school. He stated that the language with which he felt most comfortable was English, particularly in relation to literacy. His parents sent him to a Saturday morning heritage language school from Grades 1-8 so that he could maintain his L1. Additionally, he took a few Japanese courses in high school. Upon entering university, he was placed directly into a fourth-year course, although his literacy skills were assessed below grade
6. Asked why he was taking this course, his answer was "I feel somewhat obliged to learn the language of my native roots" (Questionnaire, 1/22/98).

He code-switched from one language to the other with ease; he used Japanese with the teacher and English with his classmates. When speaking Japanese, he sounded so native-like in such aspects of language use as pronunciation and appropriate conversation strategies that the hybridity of his Japanese, instantiated in many inserted English words and expressions, went almost unnoticed. Yet, at the same time, he sounded recognizably non-native. Striking in this respect was his consistent use of the casual style, appropriate for interacting with family members or peers, but not suitable for talking with his social superior (i.e., the teacher). This presented a sharp contrast to the formal style used by the other students, whose experience with Japanese was limited to JFL classrooms.

Like English, Japanese has different language styles according to the genre and the situational context in which the language is used (e.g., Maynard, 1990; Nakane, 1970); one such distinction is that between the formal and informal styles. In speech, the primary mode is the informal style, whereas the formal style is mostly used for written language. Within the informal style, there are some stylistic options available. Depending on the social situation and the social status of the participants, one must choose either the casual style (da-style) or the polite style (desu/masu-style). Jim had little problem with the casual style, but he did not use the polite style, when necessary, in a consistent way. However, noticeably absent from his speech was the more sophisticated style, involving different shades of politeness realized by honorification, which is considered as essential to full competence in spoken Japanese.40

5.2.2.1. excerpt 1: causal speech style and translation strategy. To illustrate Jim's Japanese speech style, one sequence of interaction from the first conference is presented. First, it is necessary to explain his method of composing: production of an English essay first and then translation into Japanese. What follows is the segment of Jim's essay that this conference sequence addressed:

English Version
Over the course of civilization, the role of women in society has changed. For centuries, it was understood that the woman was supposed to remain at home and take care of the children.

Japanese Version
Josee no yakuwari was chotto mae kara katei no mendoo o mi, kodomo o chanto sodateru no ga* kimaitte imashita (From a very long time ago, the role of women was fixed to take care of the family and to raise children properly).

---

40It takes Japanese children many years of social interaction in diverse contexts to develop an age-appropriate register repertoire in spoken and written language and then to select a particular register for each occasion of use.
Note. An inappropriately colloquial expression is underlined and a grammatical error is marked with an asterisk. In the brackets, the translation equivalent in English of the original Japanese passage is given; it is a direct translation from Japanese to English.

The focus in this sequence was on clarification of a sentence in the first paragraph of Jim’s first draft. The two main characteristics of Jim’s speech can be observed in this excerpt: his overreliance on the casual style of speech and his confirmation-seeking habit:

**Task 1, Sequence 7, Lexis**

102 **T:** "Dene, saisho no bun ne\" "Jyosei no yakuari wa zutto mae kara katei no mendo o mi kodomo o chanto sodateru no ga kimatte imashita\" Un, ii tai koto wa yoku wkaru n da kedo, nandaka dareka ni hanashikarete iru yoona kanji ga suru no ne\" Unn Koko de nani ga ii takatta no ka, chotto setsumei shite muraemasu ka/ (Well, the first sentence, “From a very long time ago, the role of women was fixed to take care of the family and to raise children properly”. I understand what you wanted to say, but it sounds like as if you were talking to someone. Umm Can you explain what you wanted to say here?).

103 **S:** Hai korewa maa- dento teki (Yes this um traditional?)

104 **T:** Un\ (Yes)

105 **S:** Zutto nanzen nen mo mae kara, daitai. Jyosei tachi ga, kodomo o mite. Danseitachi ga, soto ni itte hata raite/ (From many thousand years ago / in general, women taking care of children and men going out to work)

106 **T:** Naru hodo ne\ (I see)

107 **S:** Sooyuu kangae no/ (Of that sort of idea)

108 **T:** sono nanzen nen mo mae kara tte yuu no o chotto hoka no kotoba de itta hoo ga ii. 5. Kore wa eigo de nan te kangaeta no/ (Perhaps it’s better to use a different expression for “from many thousand years ago” . 5 . this one, how did you think in your English version?) [Jim did not have his English text with him]

109 **S:** A., zenzen kore wa eigo de, un eigo de kaita bun to wa mattaku chigau n da. Dakara/ (Ah, this one is completely different from my English version So)

110 **T:** Soo desu ka\ (I see)

111 **S:** Eeto eigo de kaita bun wa <kaite atta> no wa throughout civilization, socchi no hoo ga motto yokatta no kana? Kamowakan ni kedo/ (Well, in the English version, I wrote “throughout civilization” or something like that Maybe)

112 **T:** Throughout civilization

113 **S:** Nihongo de, nihongo ni yakusyu no wa/ (Translating it into Japanese)

114 **T:** Unn.. (Hmm...)

115 **S:** Chotto muzukashikatta kara\ (Because I found this a bit difficult)

116 **T:** Sore muzukashii desuyoo ne. Chokuyaku shiyou to shitara (It must’ve been difficult, if you tried to do a direct translation)
Jim’s colloquialism in Japanese is evident in this conference sequence, although when translated into English, it is difficult to discern. In turns 109, 111, 115, and 117, Jim’s original speech in Japanese contained features of the casual style, which was not suitable when talking with the teacher. For example, in turn 109, he said “Ah zenzen kore wa eigo de, un, eigo de kaita bun to wa chigau n da” (Ah, this one is completely different from my English version). The sentence ending, marked by no da (or n da) form, is the causal style instead of the polite style that should have been used (i.e., n desu). In turn 111, he ends with the expression “kanowakannai kedō” (Maybe). Again, he used the casual style “wakannai” instead of the polite style wakarimasen. Similar observations can be made for turns 115 and 117. Additionally, his use of fall-rise intonation where it was not necessary was apparent in turns 103, 107, and 109, thereby producing many embedded exchanges that sought confirmation from the teacher. Although to a lesser extent than Edward, it is clear that Jim is also capable of substantive responses. Perhaps, due to his confirmation-seeking style of speech, as is exemplified in turns 109, 111, 113, and 115, he tended to respond or initiate over several turns. Thus, his non-standard use of casual style and rising intonation marked his speech style in Japanese.

As was shown, in spoken Japanese, Jim relied on the casual style within the informal style repertoire. In written language, too, his literacy practices were limited to the informal style. Outside class, letters to his relatives in Japan were the only Japanese writing he produced. They were conversational in nature, just as his English e-mail interactions with his friends were. In addition, his reading in Japanese consisted almost exclusively of comic books, although he had
recently started to read magazines. Thus, both in spoken and written mode, his linguistic repertoire in Japanese did not involve the formal style. This narrow linguistic repertoire in Japanese stood in sharp contrast to his wide linguistic repertoire in English, resulting from his sustained reading and writing over many years.

5.2.2.2. Jim's “insular” vocabulary. Jim identified limited vocabulary as his chief weakness in his Japanese. He recounted the experience that made him acutely aware of his informal speech style characterized by what he called “insular” vocabulary:

um, and my cousin, my cousins were recently here from Japan, last year, they were saying how I sort of talk as if I was in a comic book (laughs), kind of like you know, kind of too much to my chagrin, I realize that, that's actually true, um. I do seem to use certain comic book vocabulary, you know, and I try to change that, it's kind of, it's sort of an embarrassment for me when I realize, oh my god, that's true, um, so I've tried to change that a bit, but pretty much still, it ends up me being that, for me it ends up being that, being that when I write an essay, it tends to be in conversation style. (First Interview, 2/4/98.)

In terms of his Japanese literacy practices, the major barriers he identified included limited vocabulary, unfamiliarity with formal registers, and insufficient knowledge of Chinese characters. With his grade 5 literacy skills in Japanese, reading and writing was a taxing and time-consuming activity. To Jim, reading Japanese newspapers and books, to which he had easy access at home, seemed an insurmountable task, as he encountered so many unfamiliar words. Again, he attributed the difficulty with written texts to his “insular” vocabulary:

so my really stumbling block is that all my Japanese language...like then...spoken and written...all that is what I learned from playing games and comic books and watching TV films and listening to Japanese songs...I got a really sort of limited vocabulary. (Third Interview, 4/2/98)

He reported that, although in face-to-face interaction he could always find words, writing posed more challenge because of the precision it required. He found the process of composing in Japanese daunting as he struggled to find appropriate words in a formal register to capture his intended meanings. Jim compared the process of composition in the two languages:

um, the main difference I guess, in terms of my English and my Japanese, I guess that it's that, in English I've got full confidence in my vocabulary and what I know, so I can pretty much never having, most essays I can write never needing a dictionary, um, and it also helps that I've got like spell checkers, like on the computer, so I don't even have to worry about that, um, so I know pretty much, like all of the words that I want to use, occasionally I need a thesaurus or something, but um, that's really different from my Japanese, in which, I cannot, I can write the essay but the first word of any sort of degree of difficulty, I come across, I need the dictionary right there, Japanese-English, and a Japanese

41 All the interviews were conducted in English. Jim’s English speech appears to have some non-native features, but this was the way he talked in English.
Faced with producing three Japanese essays by due dates and fueled by his desire to write "proper" essays with stylistic refinement as he did in English, he came up with several interim solutions, which he consistently drew on in the three tasks: (a) using a translation strategy by initially generating ideas and composing in English and then translating into Japanese; (b) taking full advantage of his home environment by asking his parents to suggest appropriate words or expressions "as if they were a living dictionary"; and (c) being very clear and articulate in his English draft so as to find translation equivalents in Japanese. Interestingly, it was only Jim who wrote a whole essay in English and translated it into Japanese. He commented that producing a written text in English made it easier for him to look up the words he wanted to use in an English-Japanese dictionary (Interview, 3/4/98). The next quotation summarizes Jim's perspective on this topic:

"Um, I'm really bad at just coming up on the spot in Japanese, so if I'm coming up with a proper composition, I've got to write it in English first, um, which is something I can't seem to break out of, but yeah, I write it in English first...It's like, for me, um, that way [generating ideas and composing in English and then translating into Japanese] I can pretty much break down the words I want and put the vocabulary in, and I can't do that with Japanese, because my vocabulary in Japanese is somewhat limited, actually it's really limited, um..."

(Second Interview, 3/4/98)

5.2.2.3. excerpt 2: where the translation strategy falls short. The two themes recurring in Jim's conferences and interviews were closely related to one another: (a) refinement of style appropriate for formal essay writing; and (b) a broader range of vocabulary by which he could achieve the first objective. These two themes directly corresponded to his revision goals. In the next section, I will consider his conference interactions to explore how Jim and the teacher discussed these concerns.

In his second composition on the topic of the effectiveness of lectures, Jim presented a well-balanced discussion of pros and cons associated with lecture-based learning, of which he had much first-hand experience as a first-year university student. He then argued for the important role played by tutorials to compensate for the lack of discussion and interaction in large lectures. As the teacher felt that the chosen title, "kooka no nai rekuchaa" (ineffective lectures), did not correspond to his line of argument in the essay, she initiated a discussion to address this issue:

43 T: *Taitorii no "kooka no nai rekuchaa" tte ii no chotto setsukeshite kureru?* (Can you explain your title "ineffective lectures"?)

44 J: *Aa- korewa chotto nanka, mayotta n desu kedo...korewa yappari...nanka kore, kore dattara nanka koredattara nanka useleless nanka kikoeru voa da kara* (Uh
well with this one I considered different alternative  This, after all, well this, because this may sound like as if I was saying lectures were useless...

45 T:  "Un, un sore de (Yes, yes, carry on)

46 J:  "Soo jyanai n da yo ne. Koko wa suggoku nanka zenzen, doo kaku, doo doo kaku ka zenzen waka n nain da yo ne. yappari nanka iitai no wa (That’s not the case, really. Here I just have no idea how to write, how, I I don’t know how to express it. Well, what I wanted to say was...)

47 T:  "Kooka ga nai wakejyani n da yo ne (So you didn’t want to say “ineffective”, right?)

48 J:  "Hai, yappari ...a- (No , after all ...um)

49 T:  "Jyaa, mazu chotto ittsho ni sakubun o zaa tto mite ikimashoo ka (OK Why don’t we go through your essay first?)

Recognizing Jim’s difficulty in recovering his intended meaning in Japanese, the teacher suggests in turn 49 that they should go through the whole essay first, keeping this in mind. At the end of the conference, they returned to the questionable appropriateness of Jim’s chosen title. After some discussion, it was left to Jim to think about an alternative title. In the final draft, Jim came up with a new title, “daigaku no koogi ro shitsu” (university lectures and their quality), which captured the content of his composition more appropriately, if not perfectly.

The phrase Jim used in turn 46 to express his frustration, doo kaku ka zenzen waka n nain da yo ne (I don’t have a clue as to how to express it ), was a consistent leitmotif running through all his conferences. The next excerpt, a full sequence taken from the second conference, is representative of Jim’s problems, arising from his limited vocabulary and his compensatory translation strategy. First, I present Jim’s thoughts formulated and written down in English and his translation into Japanese:

English version:
There are undeniable benefits associated with lecture learning. The fact that there is little if any student interaction with the educator provides a two fold benefit. First, it allows the educator to present more information with little interruption. Second, it allows the educator to present the information in a logical, organized fashion, a verbal essay of sorts.

Japanese Version:
Rekuchaa ni wa hitei dekinai benefittto ga arimasu. Daiichi no benefittto wa, hotonodo jyama ga hairazu ni rekuchaa o suru koto ga dekimasu. Daii no benefittto wa ronrikekina jouhoo o maru de essei no yooni gakusaitach ni tsutaeru koto ga dekimasu

(There are undeniable benefits associated with lecture learning. The first benefit of the lecture is that it can be carried out without little interruption. The second benefit of the lecture is that it can convey logical information to students as if it was an essay).

Sequence 13, Topic field=dual theme

127 T:  De, "Daini no benefittto wa ronrikekina jouhoo o maru de essei no yooni
The lecture is that it can convey logical information to students like an essay.

127 S: A. hai. eeto kore wa ..hitotsu no jyugyou nan desu kedo, classical methodology tte
yuu no ga introduction to classical methodology tte yuu no ga arun desu kedo. sore
sore nanka kyoojiyuu ga ..kyoojiyuu ga nanka 4.sugoku tonikaku honto ni essei
yonderu kibun ni natte kuru. Ichioo chanto rekuchaa sugoku omoshiroi jyugyou
nan desu kedo. hontoni nanka introduction main body no conclusion ga ...
chonto essei (Um, Yes. Well, I was thinking about a particular lecture ---
Introduction to classical methodology. Listening to the professor, professor's
lecture really makes me feel as if I was reading an essay. The class is very
interesting, and the lecture has an introduction, main body and conclusion, just
like an essay)

129 T: Aa soo desu ka. Essei no yoona koogi (Oh, I see. A lecture structured in the
format of an essay)

130 J: Hai hontoo ni essei mitai nan desu. Nanka jyugyou boku ni tottewa sorega
sugoku chanto nanka... maishuu maishuu chanto nanka aidea o fukunde..
tonikaku nanka sugoku ma. nanka sooyuu ma sooyuu kangaee de essei..kore
datara daitai rekuchaa nanka daitai essei mitaina ..chanto (Yes, really it's like
an essay. Um, every week, for me his lecture has [new] concepts ..anyhow, that's
how I thought about it...lectures were almost like essays..neatly).

131 T: Naruhodo ne. Dakara nanka eigo no essei to nohono go no essei to onaji imi da
to omotta no ne. Eeto ne, eigo no essei wa nihongo de wa zuushitsu tte iu no ne.
Nihongo de wa essei tte iu to jibun no kanjita koto o kakitometa mono tte iu imi ni
naru no ne (Oh, I see. So you equated the English word “essay”with the
Japanese word “essei”. Um the word “essay” in Japanese means um writing
down what one felt...)

132 J: A soo desu ka (Oh, really?)

133 T: Soo. nihojogo de wa essei tte iu to betsuu no imi ni naru no ne (Uhhuh, it means
something different in Japanese)

134 J: Ichioo itakatta no wa nanka verbal essay ? eigo dattara essay dattara chanto
nanka wakaru kara (Overall what I wanted to say was um an verbal essay  In
English, it makes sense)

135 T: Aa, dattara. ronritekina jyouhoo jya naku tte. jyouhoo o ronri teki ni tsutaeru jya
nain desu ka? (Well, If that's the case, what you wanted to say was not to convey
logical information but to convey information logically, right?)

136 J: Soo. jyouhoo... (Yes, information...)

137 T: Unn, kikitakatta no wa ronritekina jyouhoo o tsutaeru tte itakatta no ka,
soretomo ronritekini jyouhoo o tsutaeru tte itakatta no ka (Um What I was
asking was which you wanted to say, to convey logical information or to convey
information logically?)

138 J: Unn Aa jyouhoo to ronritekini tsutaeru (Um yes um to convey information
logically)

139T: Sorenara (In that case)
140 J: *Ronritekini jyoohoo o tsutaeru* (To convey information logically)

141 T: *Soo* (OK)

142 J: *Ano essei tte koko de tsukau to henna n dakara* (Um because it’s better not to use the word essay)

143 T: *Un, iitaikoro wa yoku wakare n da kedo, kono baai wa rombun tte ii kotoba o tsukatta hoo ga ii to omoo* (I understand what you wanted to say, but to mean what you meant in Japanese, it’s better to use the word rombun)

144 J: *Suggoku mayotta node* (Because I really had difficulty here)

His translation from English into Japanese led to some mismatches between the two languages on two levels; they were not only associated with the single word but with translation of the whole sentence. On the word level, since there was a word *essei* in Japanese, pronounced as essee and written in Katakana syllabary reserved for foreign origin words. Jim assumed that it must mean the same thing as in English. Although *essei* is a legitimate Japanese word, it refers to personal commentaries on various topics. The Japanese word equivalent to English “essay” is *rombun*. At the sentence level, it was even more problematic since Jim tried to translate through a word-to-word matching of the two languages. What follows is his original English sentence and the translation equivalent in Japanese:

**Original English text:**
Second, it [lecture learning] allows the educator to present the information in a logical, organized fashion, a verbal essay of sorts.

**Japanese translation:**
*Daini no benefitto wa ronrikekina jyoohoo o maru de essei no yooni gakuseitach ni tsutaeru koto ga dekimasu* (The second benefit of the lecture is that it can convey logical information to students like an essay).

As became clear during informal talk after the conference, when he translated “to present the information in a logical, and organized fashion” into Japanese, Jim had checked the word “logical” (*ronritekina*) and “fashion” (*ryuukoo, kata, shikata, fasshon*) in the English-Japanese dictionary. Somewhat confused by the translated equivalent for the word “fashion” involving several alternatives, he decided to use the two words about which he was certain, namely “logical” and “information”. As seen in this example, in the process of translation, he tended to simplify what he wanted to say. In the three assignments in which he used the strategy of translation, Jim reached the conclusion that it was unsatisfactory because of the different underlying grammatical structures in the two languages (Third Interview, 4/2/98).

As a confident writer in English, Jim described how he might improve his Japanese writing, which, he said, would involve extensive reading and increasing his vocabulary, with the intention of ultimately breaking out of his habit of translating from English to Japanese:
Really... if I really want to improve my writing, what I should be doing is, do a lot more reading, of Japanese, and that's how I learned English, and I figure that's probably going to be the same way for Japanese, the reason why I've got such a limited vocabulary is because I've limited myself to comic books, and what-not, um, but I've really got to read more Japanese prose, fiction, literature, literature in general, um, another problem with that, unfortunately, is that, I'm not sure how much I'd enjoy it, because like, because it's so, they tend to be chock full of kanji characters, and what-not, so I'm, I go through reading, every like five minutes I'd have to go and look it up, go look something up. Um, so right now, what I'm actually doing is reading a lot of magazines, and just trying to get, flow from that, and then, from magazines, and then maybe go to um, books and newspapers after that, um right now it seems to be a bit of an impossibility for, anyway, books and newspapers, because they're so full of kanji, but magazines tend to be all right. (First Interview, 2/4/98)

5.2.2.4. improvement in adopting the formal style. Recall that Jim was concerned about refinement of style. At first, he was somewhat puzzled by the teacher's meta comments about using an appropriate language style. However, in the end, he managed to understand the "technical vocabulary" in which she couched her explanation of the stylistic choices available in Japanese:

...*masu/desu*-style, um, um.... I did manage to figure it out in the end, like what sort of, translating into more or less English analogues, but sort of thinking "oh, I see what she's talking about", but for the first little while, I was kind of confused as to what exactly was meant by that. (First Interview 2/4/98)

...when it turns to Japanese... I lack sort of the the full range of technical vocabulary, or uh, even knowledge of grammar, so that was one of the things, so it's um, *da* form, or *de aru, masu, desu*, those, so we were talking about that, and that was what really helped me out, I was thinking, "oh, okay, well I really got to think about that", so.. (First Interview 2/4/98)

At the risk of oversimplification, the three styles at issue can be summarized as follows. The desu/masu-style and the da-style belong to the informal style; the former is more polite, while the latter is the casual style suited for interaction with social intimates or peers. The dearu-style represents the formal style, primarily used in written texts such as academic essays and newspaper articles. Although Jim was quick to recognize the formal style when reading, production of Japanese texts in conformity with it in a formal register proved to be very difficult. It took Jim the whole semester to be able to produce a Japanese essay in the formal style. The first drafts for the first two compositions were written entirely in the desu/masu-style, and this stylistic issue was taken up and discussed in the first two conferences. In his final draft for the first task, Jim succeeded in using the desu/masu-style with a few instances of the formal style; however, in the second task, both his drafts reverted back to the desu/masu-style.
Then, suddenly, in the third task, something seemed to click. His first draft had a mixture of both styles, roughly half of each. However, in the final draft, he was much more successful in using the formal writing style consistently, although a few sentences were marked with the informal style. In his evaluation of the extent to which he had achieved his goals, he assessed his stylistic improvement as 4 on a 5-point-scale; on the other hand, he was not as satisfied with his vocabulary growth, which he rated as 3.

5.2.2.5. salient features of Jim's mode of engagement. From the perspective of his participation in the conferences, then, Jim focused on refinement of style appropriate for formal essay writing and a broader range of vocabulary in concordance with his revision goals. Because he primarily used the informal style, both in spoken and written Japanese, adopting the formal style and a formal register posed a challenge. As has been described, this eventually bore fruit in his improved essay drafts, with the most noticeable change occurring in the third composition; in both drafts for the third task, he was able to adopt the formal style. To borrow Jim's words, "The whole idea of conference was about sort of forced precision" (Third Interview, 4/3/98). In the interview, he pointed out that, to refine his writing style and to increase his vocabulary, he needed to read extensively in Japanese, which required a long-term commitment. However, in order to produce Japanese compositions by due dates, he used interim solutions such as the translation strategy and taking advantage of his home environment.

In some respects, Jim was similar to Edward. First, he was almost as loquacious as Edward and was able to elaborate on his ideas in Japanese. Like Edward, once the topic was established in the nuclear exchange, Jim also initiated many dependent exchanges. These features appeared to relate to their advanced Japanese proficiency. Second, the degree of his interest in the topic and time constraints dictated how much time he put into each composition. Both found the second topic, regarding the effectiveness of lectures, more engaging than the other two, since it was a subject that they often thought about. Nonetheless, there were noticeable differences between the two students. To begin with, their speech style in Japanese was different. While Edward spoke confidently, Jim spoke more hesitantly in Japanese, marked with such features as use of rise-fall intonation where unnecessary, false starts, repetitions, and hesitations.42 Second, Jim relied heavily on the translation method so that he could write a proper essay (Third Interview, 4/3/98). As a result of this translation procedure, some of Jim’s Japanese texts were not comprehensible, an issue of which he became increasingly aware. Finally, another situational variable that differentiated them sharply was the extent to which they had deliberately been engaged in literate activities in Japanese. Compared with Edward's intentional learning of Japanese literacy, Jim’s appeared incidental. Consequently, while Jim

---

42Interestingly, Jim's Japanese speech style was similar to his English speech style, sharing such features as use of rise-fall intonation where unnecessary, false starts, repetitions, and hesitation.
had problems with adopting a formal register, Edward felt comfortable with it, perhaps due to his extensive reading in Japanese.

5.2.3. Ewan

With regards to the remaining three students with intermediate-level Japanese proficiency, their conference interactions in Japanese were not as extensive as the first two case-study students with more advanced proficiency. To a considerable degree, their limited proficiency in the target language appeared to constrain the extent to which they could express themselves in the conferences. For this reason, the case studies of these three intermediate-level students that I am about to present are shorter than the first two. However, their stories are no less important.

Ewan was a pivotal case between the two advanced and the two intermediate students selected for case studies, since he shared some features with each. His primary language being English, he was like the two advanced students. In particular, he was like Edward in two ways: (a) he was an anglophone Canadian, born to a monolingual English family, raised, and educated in English; and (b) prior to studying Japanese, the only L2 learning he had had was in Core French classes. However, in terms of Japanese language proficiency and the types of linguistic difficulties he reported, he was like the two intermediate students.

Ewan came to develop interests in Japan through his brief visit to Japan in high school. He not only took almost all the Japanese courses offered at the university but also completed a variety of Japan-related courses, ranging from Japanese history and literature to religion. Although he had few opportunities to speak or write Japanese outside his JFL classes, he read Japanese source materials related to his course work and thesis on a regular basis. Reading academic documents in Japanese was no easy task for Ewan, yet he made persistent efforts to improve his reading proficiency by constantly assigning himself more to read. Judging from his questionnaire response, his efforts were not in vain. Asked to describe his favourite experience in learning Japanese, he wrote "-reaching a point where I can comprehend most of a conversation/reading passage and being able to continue a conversation about it" (Questionnaire, 1/22/98).

While Ewan gradually gained self-confidence about his Japanese language ability as his studies progressed, language use remained his primary concern. He selected proper use of particles as his main revision goal and logical support of thesis as the secondary one. In the interview, Ewan described his personal aim for writing Japanese compositions as follows:
Um, I wanted to try and, uh, get a better, or make a conscious effort to use particles more correctly, um, wanted to work on writing a clear, concise composition, uh, and one thing that I usually try whenever I'm writing a sakubun [Japanese composition] is to try to get new vocabulary or phrases, because if someone else is going to be reviewing it, or revising it with me, then that way, if I'm using them wrong, I'll be shown the proper way, so it's a bit of a vocabulary building exercise for me, in some cases. (First Interview, 2/4/98)

Elsewhere in the same interview, Ewan reiterated that particles and vocabulary usage were his major concerns, to which he paid conscious attention while writing. Correspondingly, the topics selected for discussion in the conferences were predominantly concerned with language use. Within language use, however, it was not morpho-syntax (more specifically particle usage), his stated main revision goal, but lexis that was chosen as topic most frequently; 35 sequences centered on lexis versus 25 on syntax, of which 15 concerned particle usage. His overall goal was to develop the ability to produce clear, “error-free compositions” in Japanese:

I'm a lot more concerned with grammar [in writing in Japanese]...with correct grammar and getting the correct vocabulary...as opposed to writing in English where I'm a lot more concerned about expressing ideas succinctly and the grammar really doesn't enter my mind...it's just very natural. (Second Interview, 3/2/98)

Throughout the interviews, Ewan evidenced his concern with linguistic accuracy by frequently using expressions related to linguistic accuracy—correction, correct, being corrected, errors, error-free, mistakes.

5.2.3.1. excerpt 1: focus on form. To illustrate how Ewan and the teacher discussed his primary concern, language use, two representative sequences of conference interaction about the second assignment are presented. In this composition, on the topic of the effectiveness of lectures, Ewan discussed the pros and cons of lecture-based learning. But, first, it may be helpful to describe a relevant segment of Ewan's first draft. His original Japanese version was as follows: “Furusu no koogi de wa kyookasho no ten o moo ichido kurikaeshite, atarashii koto o narawa nakue kara, kyooikuryoku wa sukunai to omoo” (Since usually in lectures the points of the textbook are repeated and students do not learn new things, I do not think they have educational power). Instead, a better approach to lecturing, he proceeded to argue, would involve professors presenting materials in a way that is helpful for students to grasp difficult concepts more easily.

The first example from the conference interaction is a sequence dealing with the expression, kyookasho no ten (points of the textbook):

Task 2, Sequence 11, topic field=morpho-syntax

104 T: “Futsuu no koogi de wa kyookasho no ten o moo ichido kurikaeshite” kyookasho no ten tte yuu no wa nan desu ka? (“usually in lectures, the points of
the textbook are repeated”, What are the points of the textbook?)

105 E: um the points covered in the textbook (Umm the points covered in the textbook)

106 T: Aa, dattara (Ah, in that case)

107 E: kyookasho de...kai un de kyookasho de kakare... kakarete imasu. kyookashyo de .. Kai, yeah, de, kyookasho de kakare ... Kakareteimasu [polite form] (in the textbook...is written in the textbook...is written in the textbook...write yeah in is written in the textbook...is written)

108 T: kakarete irii.[plain form] Soo desu ne. Kakarete iru na hoo ga ii desu ne. Kakarete iru wa ten o shuushoku shite iru deshoo? Sorekara kyookasho ni kakarete iru....nanka kakarete iru tte yuu no wa jyootai na node [Ewan backchannels in acknowledgement] kyookasho NI kakareteituru or kyookasho DE setumeisareteiru tte tsukau to omoo n da kedo Sorekara ten yori koto tte itta hoo ga shizen da to omoimasu (kakarete iru, isn’t it? It’s better to say kakarete iru because kakarete iru modified the points, right? Is written in the textbook...since kakarete iru is a state. Either “is written in the textbook” or “is explained in the textbook” would be OK. As well, it would sound more natural if you use koto (things) instead of ten in this context)

111 E: Hai (Yes)

This short sequence shows one of the discursive features that characterized Ewan’s conference interaction: Using English to express what he found difficult to say in Japanese and using the conference as an opportunity to practise the target language form (turn 107). These features marked different ways of interacting in Japanese, as compared with the first two case-study students with advanced Japanese proficiency. In this sequence, two morphological issues, noun modifying verbal clauses and particle usage, are discussed (see Miyaji, Simon, & Ogawa, 1991). In turn 104, the teacher attempts to establish what Ewan meant by the expression kyookasho no ten (points of the textbook). In response, in turn 105, Ewan gives an explanation in English. In turn 107, Ewan offers an alternative expression in Japanese, prompted by the teacher’s completion request, “dakara” (so; in that case) with rising intonation. Ewan attempts to reformulate his intended meaning in Japanese, this time matching what he has said in turn 105. He first says kyookasho de (in the textbook), then kakareteimamus (be written) in the polite style. In turn 108, acknowledging Ewan’s reformulation, the teacher nevertheless advises Ewan to use the plain style, kakareteituru (be written), reminding him of a grammatical rule related to noun-modifying clauses. The second issue was to do with Ewan’s use of the particle ni to mean “in”. This has been one of Ewan’s recurring problems. The English preposition “in” does not map onto Japanese neatly; it corresponds to either of two particles, ni or de. In turn 108, the teacher also advises Ewan to use ni since kakarete-iru expresses a resulting state; or to use an alternative expression de setumeisarete-iru (be explained). Then, hurriedly, she adds another recommendation about the use of the noun koto (things) in place of ten (points). In the
final version, Ewan wrote: \textit{kyoukasho de setumeesaretei-ru ten}. Ewan successfully dealt with the two morphological items discussed, but the unnegotiated suggestion that the teacher made regarding \textit{koto} was not taken up.

\textbf{5.2.3.2. excerpt 2: focus on lexis.} The next sequence, focusing on the main clause of the same sentence quoted earlier, specifically addresses lexis, particularly the expression, \textit{kyouikuryoku} (educational power):

Task 2. Sequence 12, topic field=lexis

\begin{verbatim}
112 T: De \textit{"kyo-ryoku" tte iu no wa nan. nan no koto kana?} (What do you mean by "education power"?)
113 E: Ano- conducive to learning (um conducive to learning)
114 T: \textit{Oshieru chihara tte iu koto kana?} [Ewan backchannels in acknowledgement] Jyaa, \textit{kyouikukoooka tte iiitakatta no kana?} (You mean something like the ability to educate? Then, isn't what you wanted to say "educational effectiveness"?)
115 E: \textit{Kyouikukoooka?} (Educational effectiveness?)
116 T: \textit{Ee} (Uhhuh)
117 E: \textit{Ha. ano- watashi wa kono baai wa... ano... Suimasen. Ano revision suru toki ni. Ano watashi no machigae o sensei wa naoshimasu kara ano- atarashii kotoba o yarimashita} (Um...sorry um I tried to use a new expression because I knew you were going to correct me before I revise it [the first draft])
118 T: \textit{Aa- naruhodo ne} (Oh I see)
119 E: \textit{Ano- dakara atarashii kotoba o tsukaimashita} (That's why I used this expression)
120 T: \textit{Naruhodo ne. Sorede iiitakatta no wa kyouikukoooka ga usui tte iu koto ga iiia n desu yo ne} (I see. Then, is what you wanted to say was "not educationally effective"?)
121 E: \textit{Hai, demo, kyouikuryoku wa dame desu ka?} (Yes but can I not use "education ability"?)
122 T: \textit{Ano- kimatta hyogen ga aru toki wa sore o tsukatta hoo ga ii desu ne} [Ewan scribbles down \textit{kyouikukoooka} in Kanji and showed it to the teacher] \textit{Hai, soo desu ne. Sorekara, kyouikukoooka ga usui tte tsukaimasu ne} (Well, when there is a commonly used expression for what you want to say, it's better to use it. Yes, that's right. Um as a set phrase, it's often used as "educational effectiveness is weak")
123 E: \textit{Hai, wakarimashita} (Yes, I see)
\end{verbatim}

As shown in this sequence, Ewan had difficulties in expressing his intended meaning in Japanese due to his insufficient vocabulary. Particularly problematic were commonly used set phrases such as \textit{kyouikikoooka} (effectiveness of education). An English equivalent of \textit{kyouikuryoku} would be "educational power" or "the ability to educate", as \textit{kyouiku} refers to
education and *ryoku* refers to ability or power. In some cases, Ewan reported, it was difficult to locate appropriate expressions in dictionaries, even after consulting at least five different types of dictionaries--Kanji, Japanese/English, English/Japanese, word formation, and grammar dictionaries. This resulted in his creating non-standard expressions out of the words he knew. After the first conference, Ewan felt secure enough to risk making errors in Japanese because:

> there's going to be someone revising it with me I feel a lot more easy about using new vocabulary that I can find out the exact context that it's best to use it in...actually there were a few things in this composition where I deliberately went out on a limb knowing that it was a pretty good chance it was wrong but I did that because I knew I would be corrected.

(Second Interview, 3/2/98)

### 5.2.3.3. salient themes in Ewan's interviews.

I now turn to Ewan's interviews to explore his perspective on the issues discussed in the previous paragraphs and on composing in Japanese in general. Several themes emerged as salient in the interviews: (a) thinking and composing in different languages; (b) strategies to cope with linguistic difficulties; and (c) the effect of revision activity.

Ewan's frustration in producing Japanese compositions was primarily to do with the gap between cognition and language, due to his limited linguistic resources in Japanese. He also mentioned that his thinking in English might be a hindrance in writing in Japanese:

> I tend to come up with ideas in English and then trying to get it down clearly in Japanese is really difficult for me, and I'm not sure whether that's because of a lack of vocabulary, or whether because I'm thinking in a very English-language kind of way, and trying to impose that structure onto Japanese, um, so that's very frustrating where I have an idea, and expressing it clearly is very difficult...Um...sounds crazy, but I kind of wish that I could THINK in Japanese when I was writing, rather, 'cause right now, I very much think in English, and then try and write in Japanese, where I feel if I was doing the whole process in Japanese, it would be a lot easier, and the end result would be a lot better.

(First Interview, 2/4/98)

As shown in these interview excerpts, Ewan formulated his thoughts in English in his head and attempted to express his thoughts in Japanese in writing. In this respect, Ewan's approach to Japanese compositions was similar to Jim's. Like Jim, in order to meet the deadlines for the assigned compositions, Ewan developed interim strategies to compensate for his limited linguistic resources in Japanese. The first strategy he used was trying out new vocabulary and narrowing down the word choices. Another frequently used strategy involved simplification of the sentence structures in an attempt to retain his original meanings: "I have to split up ideas into smaller sentences that I know I can make very clear, rather than more complex structures"

(First Interview, 2/4/98). However, in some cases, he modified his text intention so that he
could express it in Japanese and, in others, he was forced to abandon his ideas: “If there are certain things that I know are just going to be too difficult for me to do accurately I might just dump them or let them slide...” (Second Interview, 3/2/98).

Ewan also commented extensively on how the process of write-conference-revise made him aware of the process of revising. Although he used to “just plough ahead with whatever seems right at the time”, he spent more time revising, making sure he was “learning something from the mistakes before” (Third Interview, 4/2/98). For instance, while revising, he went back to dictionaries to confirm what had been discussed in the conference. He described the whole process of write-conference-revise as creating an opportunity for “a much more conscious learning of the language”. He explained why:

...because for me I'm sitting down, trying to express things correctly so it's very much a...examining my own preconceptions about grammar and by going through the process of checking with good grammatical dictionaries and revising the essay...internalizing it. (Third Interview, 4/2/98)

5.2.3.4. salient features of Ewan's mode of engagement. In sum, Ewan was acutely aware of the gap between his cognition and language when composing in Japanese and noted that having ideas was one thing but expressing them was quite another. Ewan used compensatory strategies to compose in Japanese; they ranged from trying out new vocabulary and simplifying sentence structures to abandoning his original ideas. As he identified the major barrier to his composing in Japanese as an insufficient mastery of grammar and vocabulary, he was most concerned with language use issues. As a result, the majority of his conference discussions centered on lexis and morpho-syntax, including his stated primary revision goal, correct particle usage. He described his ultimate goal as the production of an “error-free” composition in Japanese. He regarded the three sets of write-conference-revise activities as an opportunity for conscious learning of the target language. As such, he spent time revising his first drafts, ensuring that he could learn from his mistakes.

Unlike Edward and Jim, Ewan had more basic concerns with grammar, sentence structure, and vocabulary. In his conferences, language use was predominantly selected as the topic, which in turn, placed the teacher in the position of the primary knower. Additionally, as the two examples of the conference interaction showed, the extent to which Ewan could express himself in Japanese was quite constrained. His speech style in English was clear, concise, and confident. By contrast, in Japanese, not only did he rely on his English but he used much simpler sentence structures in shorter chunks. This presented a sharp contrast both to Edward and to Jim who managed to express and elaborate on their thoughts in Japanese. Clearly, his limited proficiency in the target language affected the degree to which Ewan was able to participate in Japanese in the conferences. Unlike the advanced students, who were as loquacious
as the teacher and frequently initiated dependent exchanges, Ewan tended to position himself (or was positioned) as the primary knower/respondent who explained his intended meanings and attempted to reformulate thoughts in Japanese accurately and appropriately with the teacher’s help. Who initiated or who responded was not a primary concern to him, but rather developing skills to self-correct his compositions was what he aimed for. In Ewan’s words, what he hoped to gain from the conference experience was as follows: “That in the future I’ll be able to write and revise my own Japanese essays on my own and reach a fairly acceptable level of correctness” (Second Interview, 3/2/98).

5.2.4. Chris

Chris was quiet and soft-spoken. Like the other three Chinese students in class, he was born and raised in Taiwan with Mandarin as his L1 and became literate initially in Chinese. He came to Canada at the age of 14, completed high school, and proceeded to study at the university. What distinguished Chris from other Chinese students in this class was the extent to which he had led a highly literate life in his L1. He not only read extensively in Chinese but wrote diaries, letters, and commentaries on the articles that interested him on a regular basis. Chris was very confident about his Chinese literacy skills and assessed them on a par with his native peers. Perhaps this was because his family ensured that he spent his summer holidays in Taiwan working in his uncle’s company and being immersed in the Chinese language and culture for at least several months per year.

Being studious, Chris excelled in his first degree, but the same diligence did not pay off as visibly and promptly in his JFL courses. Although he took almost all the JFL courses offered at the university and worked hard, he continually struggled to produce a few sentences at a time in Japanese. His Japanese proficiency was rated Intermediate-low according to the JST, one of the lowest ratings in this class. Throughout the school year, he regularly visited the teacher during her office hours to ask questions. He attributed his difficulties in learning Japanese to the lack of reinforcement opportunities in the target language. Chris characterized L2 learning in general as a long, arduous process of struggling with the language. In learning English in Canada, however, he felt that the abundance of opportunities to use it in diverse contexts facilitated his mastery of the target language greatly. By contrast, he had few opportunities to use Japanese outside his JFL classes.

Like Ewan, improvement in terms of overall accuracy in grammar and vocabulary was Chris’ major concern, which he subsequently selected as his primary revision goal, with a focus on particle usage. His secondary goal was the production of fluent prose with clearly stated
ideas. The topics selected for discussion in the conferences reflected his priority: while 17% of the sequences focused on content/organization, 78% centered on language use, and the remaining 5% on meta comments. However, unlike Ewan, there were more sequences related to morpho-syntax than to lexis (28 vs. 17), perhaps as a reflection of his lower Japanese proficiency. Although Chris considered an elegant rhetorical structure and fluent expression of ideas the most important goal in any writing, much of his attention in the production of Japanese texts was devoted to linguistic accuracy below the level of clause so as to achieve clarity of meaning. As he put it, "sometimes a small mistake changes all" (Second Interview, 3/2/98).

Typically, in the conferences, Chris and the teacher discussed lexico-grammatical problems below the level of clause at length before considering a larger unit of text. When this shift in focus from language use to overall structure occurred, it also marked a shift in interactional dynamics. In sequences with a focus on language use, Chris tended to position himself in the role of responder and focused on getting the form correct and understanding why it was correct, reminiscent of Ewan's behavior in the conferences. On the other hand, when the topic concerned content and organization, albeit infrequently, he adopted a more proactive stance and initiated dependent exchanges, evaluating his composition holistically and suggesting appropriate structural changes. The types of revision that Chris subsequently made appeared to parallel these differences in the interactional pattern in the conferences. While the majority of lexico-grammatical changes were directly attributable to the conferences, the changes in rhetorical structure went far beyond the conference discussions, involving a major re-working of the text. Chris showed substantial improvement in his final drafts in nearly all aspects of the compositions, as assessed by the external raters.

5.2.4.1. excerpt 1: focus on language form. To explore the link between how he talked in the conferences and how he revised, I now turn to Chris' conference interactions. Two representative sequences, one focusing on grammar and the other focusing on overall structure, are presented to illustrate how Chris talked differently according to the nature of the topic.

In the first excerpt, a sequence focusing on grammar, Chris and the teacher went over a clause that the teacher had found difficult to comprehend. The clause in question contained Chris' perennial problems: particle usage and tense/aspect distinction. It read: kanada no daigakusei no seikatsu wa motto shimpaishimasu (university students' life in Canada worries more):

Task 2, Sequence 14, Topic field=morpho-syntax

197 T: "Kanada no daigakusei no seikatsu wa" [reading the passage in the first draft], sekatsu ga shimpa-suru n desu ka? ("university students' life in Canada", is it life that worries?)
198 C: It’s... (It’s...)

199 T: *Dare ga shimpai-shite-iru n desu ka?* (Who is worried?)

200 C: *Aa-daigasei Kanada no daigakusee wa* [topic-marking particle]? (Ah university students Canadian university students?)

201 T: *Soo desu ne. Sorede, kadada no daigakusei wa nani nan no koto o shimpai-shite-iru n desu ka?* (Right um uh what what are these Canadian university students worried about?)

202 C: *Un... (Um)*

203 T: *Seiseki desu ka? Soretomo daigakuseikatsu no koto?* (Their grades or their life in university?)

204 C: *Their life in university um daigakuseikatsu O* [object-marking particle]?

205 T: *Soo desu ne. De kanada no daigakusee wa, daigakuseekatsu NO KOTO O* (That’s right. Canadian students about their university life)

206 C: *Hai daigakuseikatsu no koto o shimpai-shimasu* (Yes they worry about their university life)

207 T: *Uun shimasu tte in no wa doo kana?* (Um is “worry” appropriate here?)

208 C: *Shimpai-shite-imasu* (be worried)

209 T: *Un soo desu ne. Shimpai-shite-iru desu ne.* (That’s right, be worried)

210 C: OK

These particular grammar points being recurring topics in the conference, the teacher attempts to solicit a response from Chris without additional explanation. She attempts to clarify the intended meaning in turn 197, rephrasing the question in turn 199. In the next turn, Chris comes up with a correct answer and asks for confirmation with rising intonation. In turn 201, the teacher acknowledges the accuracy of his answer and initiates a dependent exchange, this time attempting to clarify another element in the passage. Here, as in the nuclear exchange, the teacher rephrases her question in turn 203. In the ensuing turn, Chris supplies a correct answer (object-marking particle 0) and again asks for confirmation, using rising intonation. Then, in turn 207, the teacher shifts her attention to the aspectual form of the verb *shimpai-shuru* (to worry). As this has been dealt with several times in the conference, the teacher directly asks for an appropriate form without explanation. In turn 208, Chris is able to get the aspectual form, *-teiru*, correctly. What follows are his comments on this segment of the interaction:

...usually I don’t really know I made a mistake, for example present tense to present continuative tense, *shiteiru*, and I usually forget about it...I probably need more, uh, training on the, uh correct usage. (First Interview, 2/4/98)
In his final draft, Chris did a verbatim transfer from the conference discussion. His revised version read: *Kanada no daigakusee wa daigakuseekatsu no koto o motto shimpaiwashiteimasu* (Canadian university students are more worried about their life in university [than university students in Taiwan are]).

**5.2.4.2. excerpt 2: evidence of Chris’ well-developed L1 writing abilities.** The second excerpt shows how Chris interacted when the topic concerned discourse organization. In this sequence, the discussion focused on a missing thematic link between the first and second half of his composition. In the first half, consisting of three paragraphs, Chris compared the university systems in Canada and Taiwan and their effects on students’ attitudes toward studying. Then, in the second half, Chris discussed lecture-based learning in general terms and briefly compared lectures under the two systems. At issue in this sequence was the fourth paragraph, inserted between these two main parts, describing students’ involvement in extra-curricular activities in the two systems. In terms of interactional features, what was noticeable in this sequence, as compared with the previous one, was that Chris switched to English completely and that he initiated three exchanges in turns 236, 238, and 240. Interestingly, in response to the teacher query in turns 233 and 235, he made a “pivot move” (Wells, 1981, p. 33) in 236, i.e., a responding move that initiates a new sequence, and took over the conversational floor:

**Task 2, Sequence 19, Topic field=discourse organization**

233 T: *Urn daiyondanraku na n da kedo nanka hokano bubun to tsunagatte-nai kanji ga suru no ne* (Um the fourth paragraph seems an odd one out to me)

234 C: Um

235 T: *Ano koko made wa Taiwan to Kanada no daikakusei no benkyoo no taisuru taido no koto o hanashite-kimashita ne Koko de kyuui ni kagaikatudoo no hanashi ni utsutte-shimatta node chotto bikkuru shita n desu kedo ne Koko no tsunakari o hakkiri-saseta hoo ga ii to omoor n desu kedo (uh ...um so far you’ve compared the two systems in terms of students’ attitude toward studying, Then in this paragraph, you suddenly switched to extra-curricular activities. Perhaps you need a transitional phrase here to make it cohere)*

236 C: What if I .. I put this paragraph [the fourth paragraph about extra-curricular activities] at the little back .. Or.. Or just eliminate the whole, whole thing about extra-curricular activities

237 T: *Naruhodo ne* (I see)

238 C: This is about studying [referring the first three paragraphs] and then it’s better to move right into the discussion of lectures

239 T: *Soo desu ne, (Right yeah)*

240 C: Actually I can just delete this paragraph [the fourth paragraph] and ...
241 T: Tabun sono hoo ga ii to omoo. Demo ne, tsunagari o hakkiri-saseta hoo ga ii to omoo n da kedo. (Yes that would be better. But I still think you need a transitional sentence or two)

242 C: Hai, wakarimashita. (Yes, I'll think about it)

243 T: Soo desu ne

Chris' final draft shows that his independent thinking went beyond what was discussed in this sequence. As he had proposed, Chris deleted the short paragraph about extra-curricular activities. He also merged the short paragraphs involving discussion of lecture-based learning in general terms and the next paragraph involving a comparison of lectures in the two systems. In addition, to make his argument coherent, he added two sentences at the beginning of the fourth paragraph that functioned as a thematic link: "Kanada to taiwan no daigakuseido no chigai no riyuu go moo hitotsu arimasu"; and "Sorekara, koogi no hoohoo wa fudoo desu" (There is yet another reason why the university systems in Canada and Taiwan are different; furthermore, the method of lectures is not the same). Following that, he argued that the effectiveness of lecture-based learning depends on the nature of the subject matter. In this way, he succeeded in making his essay more coherent and comprehensible. Although these transitional sentences contained some obvious linguistic errors, they did not hinder comprehension in a significant way.

Chris' ability to look at his prose and reorganize the overall structure had perhaps to do with his highly developed writing skills in his L1. When revising his first drafts after the conferences, Chris reported that he attended both to lexico-grammar and the overall flow of his prose as he would normally do when composing in his L1:

Uh, well I, during the revision, I sort of, uh, wrote down the mistakes I had, uh, when she [the teacher] pointed out, on the same piece of paper, and when I go back, I try to find out the mistakes, and to see if that fits to my meaning, on the paragraph, and um, that's the first thing I do, then I try to look at the whole thing, that is what I was trying to sort out, yeah. (Second Interview, 3/2/98)

In the interviews, Chris mentioned that producing first drafts in Japanese was such a laborious process that he found it difficult to attend to the overall structure of his prose. Although he could generate his ideas and directly express them in Chinese with ease, this was not the case in composing in his L2 and L3:

I think I do more practice in Chinese, because I write my diaries in Chinese, yeah, so I think for those kind of things, I tend to, it becomes second nature, yeah, and but for English, I think I have to be a little bit forceful, to generate the ideas, and yeah, it's the same as Japanese, 'cause I'm not very used to speaking or writing, it takes more time. (Second Interview, 3/2/98)
His strategy to be “forceful” in producing Japanese compositions was to brainstorm and to jot down ideas in whatever language he felt fit to use for his purposes:

...uh, sometimes I just, of course I translated to the language that I know better, my mother language or English, and then try to put it together, in Japanese, and...yeah I just, uh, struggle to write down everything and then put it together... um...I think that jot down most of stuff, and then restructure it is easier. (First Interview, 4/2/98)

Thus, for Chris, producing a Japanese composition involved simultaneous use of the three languages with which he had different degrees of familiarity. He used them to brainstorm, to jot down and bring together his ideas, and to express them ultimately all in Japanese.

5.2.4.3. salient features of Chris’ mode of engagement. As has been discussed, like Ewan, Chris’s primary concern was linguistic accuracy, correct use of grammar and vocabulary as he put it. Like Ewan, he wanted to be able to write what he meant, using Japanese lexico-grammar appropriately. The topics selected for discussion in conference predominantly concerned language use, reflecting his primary concern with linguistic accuracy, also his main goal in revision. Depending on the nature of the topics selected, the interactional dynamics changed considerably. In language-use related sequences, Chris tended to take the role of respondent with substantive answers, focusing on getting the form correct. On the other hand, in sequences concerning the overall flow of his prose, he tended to initiate dependent exchanges and offered his opinions actively; he did this through the medium of English. These differences in the oral interaction appeared to be paralleled in the types of revision made. While changes in lexico-grammar tended to be transfer directly from the conferences, changes in rhetorical structure involved a major re-working of the text, pointing to Chris’s independent thinking.

According to the external raters, Chris showed improvement in nearly all aspects of his second drafts in the three assignments. What probably made this overall improvement possible was his highly developed writing skills in his L1, on which he was able to draw while revising.

Thus, Chris was similar to Ewan in terms of his primary concern with linguistic accuracy and his struggle to produce sentences in Japanese. However, in one respect, these two students differed greatly, depending on whether their L1 used a Chinese character-based script or not. Ewan, a native speaker of English, struggled with Chinese characters continuously and opted for composing his Japanese essays on the computer, using his Japanese word processing program. This way, although he needed to recognize and choose appropriate characters, he did not have to produce these characters manually. By contrast, Chris felt more comfortable writing in Japanese than in English because of his familiarity with Chinese characters.
5.2.5. Clive

Clive was taciturn, practical, and competent. He communicated confidently but with impressive brevity. He was very direct, to the point, and concise without any frivolous comments. No detours for Clive. No elaboration unless he felt it necessary. Learning Japanese à la Clive involved careful digestion of what had been taught: mastering linguistic rules quickly and using them accurately in carrying out communicative tasks in class. In the whole class setting, he rarely spoke, unless he had specific questions to ask or was asked to respond. With this general approach to learning, he excelled in his studies and appeared comfortable with his learning style. Clive did not appear to have any inclination to conform to the North American norm of an assertive interactional style. When he needed some help with grammar, he would opt for discussing it with the teacher in private until he understood it.

Like Chris, Clive was born and raised in Taiwan with Mandarin as his L1 and initial literacy in Chinese. From the age of 14 onwards, he pursued his studies in Canada through the medium of English. As with everything else, Clive had a very clear goal for his future career and selected his majors at the university accordingly. He wanted to become a business executive in a Japanese company in Taiwan. Thus, he majored in economics and East Asian studies, and was about to complete two bachelor degrees. He welcomed the write-conference-revise activity with pragmatic positiveness: “I think it’s good for my reading ability too and since I’m looking for a job in a Japanese company in the future this will definitely help” (Second Interview, 3/2/98).

Similar to Ewan and Chris, Clive’s experience with Japanese was almost exclusively limited to his JFL classes. As a student with intermediate Japanese proficiency, like Ewan and Chris, his priority was improvement in the correct use of vocabulary and grammar, to which he had to consciously attend while writing, unlike when writing in his L1. However, there were three things that made Clive distinct from the other two. First, while Ewan and Chris struggled to produce essays in Japanese, writing from a general point of view, Clive personalized all the compositions, relating them to his life and thus making them more linguistically manageable. Second, he reported that he primarily thought and wrote in Japanese, using Chinese occasionally as a back-up, whereas the others expressed their frustrations about having to formulate their thoughts in language(s) with which they felt comfortable and then having to translate them into Japanese. By contrast, Clive thought of something to say and let his ideas flow in Japanese: “Since Japanese is a whole different language, I think it’s more efficient to just think in Japanese” (Second Interview, 3/2/98). Third, unlike the other two, the gap between cognition and linguistic competency in Japanese did not emerge as a major theme in Clive’s interviews and conferences. Both in spoken and written language, Clive was observed to speak
and write within his current Japanese abilities and left it at that. He used short utterances with relatively simple structures, both in his Japanese compositions and in his conference interactions in Japanese. Similarly, his English utterances in the interviews were direct, short, and thus easy to understand. For example, asked what changes he made as a result of the conference talk on his first writing assignment, Clive said, "My first paragraph was only consisting of one sentence, it was too short, so I added two, three clauses more". Although David attempted to probe the nature of the changes made, Clive apparently looked puzzled, and said, "I don't get the question" (First interview, 2/4/98). As will be described in the next section, despite Clive's simple explanation, framed in terms of the revision operations that he used, the modifications he made required skill in assessing his composition as a whole in order to reorganize his argument to make it coherent.

5.2.5.1. excerpt 1: focus on more refined use of vocabulary. Clive's primary goal in revision was appropriate use of vocabulary and grammatical accuracy, with a particular focus on lexis. The topics selected for discussion in the conferences reflected his priority. Language use comprised 73.5% of all the topics selected, of which 68% focused on lexis and the remaining 32% on morpho-syntax. To illustrate how Clive discussed his first drafts with the teacher in the conferences, two representative sequences are presented. The first excerpt is a sequence related to the third assignment. The discussion in this sequence concerned appropriate use of two lexical items within one clause, in which he pointed out the disadvantage of life-time employment. The relevant segment of Clive's first draft was as follows, with target words underlined: Ichido kaisha ni haittara, shigoto o yamete, hoka no kaisha ni hairu hito wa ninna ni warui to omowaremasu kara, chotto fujyuu da to omoimasu (Once employed by a company, individuals who quit their current jobs and enter a different company are considered bad by other people, I don't think it [life-time employment] is a flexible system):

Task 3, Sequence 14, Topic field=lexis

15 T: "shigoto o yamete hoka no kaisha ni hairu hito wa. minna ni wa warui to omowaremasu kara" [reading the passage], koko chotto setumeishite moraemasuka? ("individuals who quit their current jobs and entering into a different company are considered bad by other people", can you explain this phrase?)

16 S: Anoo ichido kaisha ni haittara, soko soko sono kaisha no shigoto o yamete, hoka no kaisha ni hairu to suru to, minna ga konohito no warui to omoimasu (Um, if one enters a certain company, ... There there if one quits the job at that company, and enters another company, um, everyone thinks ill of the person)

17 T: Aa, warui hito da tte omou n desu ka? (Ah, consider him/her as a bad person?)

18 S: Ano chuuseishin ga nai to (Um I meant a person who lacks loyalty)

19 T: Chuuseishin ga nai. Naruhodo ne. Un...Un, sorenara yoku wakarimasu.
In this sequence, Clive makes his characteristic moves in turn 16, 18, and 20. In turn 15, the teacher asks Clive to explain the passage in question. In turn 16, he complies and gives a detailed response. The teacher then queries the expression, warui hito, with rising intonation. In turn 18, Clive thinks fast and comes up with a more appropriate alternative that he studied in class for the same unit. In the second half of turn 19, the teacher shifts to her second query, the use of verb, hairu (enter) and asks whether Chris knows another expression. As is typical of Clive, he quickly recalls an appropriate word that he had learned, utsuru (move) and asks for confirmation in turn 20 to see whether he got the word correctly. In the final draft, he did a verbatim transfer from the conference discussion.

5.2.5.2. excerpt 2: evidence of Clive’s well-developed L1 writing abilities. The next example, a sequence discussing the first assignment, dealt with discourse organization. Although in general, the discussion of content/organization tended to produce longer sequences across the students, this was not necessarily the case with Clive. Just as he did in language-use related sequences, he came up with some type of solution promptly, without much discussion, and the exchanges tended to be short and direct, as exemplified in the following sequence:

Task 1, Sequence 2, Topic field=discourse organization

5 T: Jyaa, ichidanraku goto miteikimashoo ka. Shitsumon ga attara dondon shitekudasai ne. Sorekara, nanika hanashitai koto ga attara, ittekudasai ne. Eeto, daiichidanraku to dainidaraku wa ii desu ka? Koko de kuraibu-san no iiitai koto wa ano jyosei ga shigoto-suru no ni wa sansei tte ii koto desu yo ne. Unn (Let’s take a look at one paragraph at a time, shall we? If you have any questions, just go ahead and ask. If there is anything you want to talk about them, go ahead with it as well. Well how about the first and second paragraphs? Your general point here is um that you are supportive of women’s participation in the labor force, isn’t it? um)

6 S: A, kono danraku wa mijikasugimasu ne. Moo sukoshi setsumeishita hoo ga ii desu ne (Ah, this paragraph is way too short, isn’t it? [consisting of one short sentence], I should explain more, shouldn’t I?)

7 T: Soo desu ne Nande kuraibu-san ga jyosei no shakaishinshitsu ni sansei na no ka setsumeisuru to ii to omoimasu (I would think so. It’s a bit patchy. Um perhaps
add another sentence explaining why you support working women would help)

8 S:  Saigo no danraku to no thematic link o kaita hoo ga ii desu ne (I should make the thematic link with the last paragraph clear, shouldn't I?)

9 T:  A. soo desu ne (That sounds good)

In his final draft, he added a fairly complex sentence on his own that had a thematic link with the last paragraph: "Hito wa minnna jibun no ishi ga arimasu kara, jyosei dakara ie ni inakereba ikemasen, to iuyoona kannen de wa, josei ni hijooni fukoohei da to omoimasu" (As all of us have our own wills, I think that the traditional idea that women should stay home is extremely gender-biased). Although this sentence contained some minor linguistic mistakes, it did not hinder comprehension. The sentence helped make his prose less choppy and his point clearer and more persuasive. In this way, like Chris, Clive improved in nearly all aspects in his second drafts. The difference between the two students was that while Chris switched totally into English in order to discuss the macro-structure of his composition in the conferences, Clive persisted in Japanese using simple and short sentences, but making his points effectively.

5.2.5.3. salient features of Clive's mode of engagement. As shown in these sequences, although Clive was not loquacious in the conferences, he did not give the impression that he was linguistically constrained to the same extent as Ewan and Chris, since he talked in a similar way in English. His interactional style in the conferences, in sequences concerning language use, was like that of Ewan and Clive, typically playing the role of respondent with substantive answers. With slight probing and assistance from the teacher, he quickly came up with correct or appropriate alternatives. In sequences related to content and organization, like Chris, he tended to initiate dependent exchanges, as in turns 6 and 8, and to offer solutions quickly, using Japanese to express his thoughts. Clive had an impressive ability to make the writing assignments and conference interactions manageable for himself so as to successfully complete them without much frustration. When producing Japanese compositions, he adopted a personalized approach to writing, wrote within his current Japanese capabilities, and used short, simple structures that were linguistically manageable. Similarly, in the conferences, he used short sentences with uncomplicated structures and did not appear to attempt to stretch himself beyond his current Japanese linguistic competency. However, in a characteristically Clive way, when he had questions, he was explicit about them and persisted until he was satisfied with the answers given. As compared with his minimal participation in oral discussion in the whole class, group, and pair work, he indeed talked substantially more in the conferences.43

43My judgement of Clive as being relatively taciturn in these contexts was based on my observation in class over a period of two years and the results of the study that I had conducted in Clive's tutorial regarding the nature of discursive practices in the classroom (Haneda, 1996).
Although studying Japanese appeared to come naturally to Clive, the interviews revealed that he had been systematically approaching the writing assignments as a learning opportunity. He kept a notebook in which he listed the mistakes in his essays that were pointed out in the conferences, made detailed notes on them, and entered the relevant information from different sources. He used the notebook as his reference when he composed and revised. According to Clive, the conferences were useful since, after each conference, when "I walked out of there [the teacher's office] I knew what types of mistakes I made and how to correct them" (Third interview, 4/2/98). However, what he found most helpful in consolidating his learning was the actual process of revision: going over his first draft for a second time on his own. The following quotation summarizes Clive's thoughts on the subject:

...the revision...without revision I wouldn't really ....even if I had the answers in the first conversations [the conferences] I wouldn't really commit it to memory without doing revisions. (Third Interview, 4/2/98)

Clive's comments echoed those of the other four case-study students and pointed to the importance of the reinforcement opportunities for language learning provided by the conferences and subsequent revisions.

One observation to be added about Clive was that he was rated as intermediate-mid according to the JST, one band lower than Ewan. This came as a surprise, since Clive tended to perform classroom tasks very competently. Conforming with this more positive impression, the external raters consistently assigned the highest scores to Clive's first and final drafts among the intermediate students. One inference to be made about his lower rating in the JST is that this assessment might be a direct result of the nature of the test. Since the JST is a tape-simulated test of spoken Japanese, there was no interlocutor interacting with the test-taker. As has been demonstrated, Clive tended only to elaborate when he felt it necessary to achieve his own objective or when he was prompted to do so. It is possible that Clive did not give enough language samples in the Japanese Speaking Test, as he would opt for expressing his thoughts as briefly as possible.

5.2.6. Summary of the Five Case Studies

While the five mini-case studies show that differences in Japanese proficiency clearly go a considerable way towards accounting for the differences among the case-study students, they also suggest that differential proficiency in itself is not a sufficient explanation of the diversity. Underlying the students' unique modes of engagement with the writing activity was...
the complex interaction between their target-language proficiency and other factors. Table 5.2 presents a summary of the students' individual attributes with respect to the dimensions on which they differed. This table is not intended to be exhaustive, as other prominent factors identified in the case studies will be considered in the next section.

Table 5.2. Summary of the Dimensions on which the Students Differed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions on which they differed</th>
<th>Edward</th>
<th>Jim</th>
<th>Ewan</th>
<th>Chris</th>
<th>Clive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First language</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium of education</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Chinese/ English</td>
<td>Chinese/English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant language of literacy</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to Japanese prior to taking university JFL classes</td>
<td>One-year study in Japanese high school; tutoring</td>
<td>Home language; heritage language school</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>One high-school JFL course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporaneous use of spoken Japanese outside class</td>
<td>Occasional use with friends</td>
<td>Daily use with family and friends</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional styles in English &amp; Japanese</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Considerably constrained in Japanese</td>
<td>Considerably constrained in Japanese</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision goals</td>
<td>Clarity of meaning in overall aspects of the writing</td>
<td>Refinement of writing style with a broader range of vocabulary</td>
<td>Language use: correct vocabulary &amp; grammar</td>
<td>Language use: correct vocabulary &amp; grammar</td>
<td>Language use: a wider range of vocabulary &amp; grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Japanese language proficiency was measured by the Japanese Speaking Test

5.3. Additional Observations

In this section, shifting the focus to the sample as a whole, I follow up on three particular situational factors that were previously observed to affect the students' performance in the writing activity: (a) the students' views on the effects of the assigned topics and the time available for writing on the production of their first drafts; (b) their perspectives on the conference-revise components of the writing activity; and (c) their strategies for composing in Japanese. While the first two are closely tied to the nature of the writing tasks themselves,
which is relatively independent of the students' Japanese proficiency, their composing strategies reflected the nature of their differential proficiency in Japanese. In order to carry out a thorough exploration of each factor, I used all the data available for the analyses; in this section, in particular, I have drawn on the responses that the students made in the retrospective interviews.

5.3.1. Effects of Topics on Initial Text Production

Although the students as a group had considerable input in the choice of topics, their enthusiasm for each writing task varied significantly, depending on the personal relevance of the particular topic and the time available for writing. The majority of the students reported that the second topic, the effectiveness of lecture-based learning, was most engaging, since it bore directly on their life as university students, whereas they did not find the first and third topics personally relevant or engaging. Given that the topic selection was based on group consensus and not reflective of the individual students' interests, this finding was hardly surprising. However, since both common and individualistic reactions deserve further discussion, I examine the patterns of reaction to each topic in turn.

The first topic, women's place in society, led to the most divergent reactions. The two anglo-Canadian students, Edward and Ewan, found it sexist and difficult to write about, since gender equality was something that they took for granted. However, they handled this difficulty very differently. Ewan simply could not come to terms with discussing something that was "so patently obvious" to him, as shown in his comments: "It [the topic] was about the, whether women should, whether women should have their place in the home or not, and I found it really hard to write about, because there is no question in my mind" (First interview, 2/4/98). By contrast, Edward decided that he might as well have "fun" with the assignment and took a devil's advocate stance, gathering information from his female colleagues:

...it was neat because I went into my office...and I told my girlfriends, like, friends who are girls, that uh, I was doing this topic, right, they got all crazy on me, how can you do this topic (smiling), but, I was asking them for points, you know, how can I improve this, because I didn't have any points, I didn't, I didn't like, even the points I put in here were kind of dumb... I mean like, they took long to get ready in the morning, I mean it's kind of like (laughs), okay, I'm going to work, but, I mean a lot of those points I got from the, the females in my office, so it was really, it was a nice uh, they had a lot of fun, coming up with ideas, we had a good time...

(Edward, First interview, 2/4/98.)

In contrast, the two female students responded to the topic with genuine personal interest. For example, June, who was trying to find work in Japan at the time, pointed out that
unless society as a whole proactively supported gender equity, real change would never occur. These female students opted for challenging the premise of achieved gender equality that Edward and Ewan took for granted. Clive also found the topic personally meaningful, as it was related to his family's life; he commented that in his composing everything just flowed. The remaining four students approached the topic in a non-committal manner. Jim's comments sum up this group's general attitude:

"Um...it's not something I actually give too much thought about, because, but I do actually notice, um, things like, um, changes in the society for women in Japan, and... um, at least in terms of sort of Canadian or North American perspective, it's sort of like the idea of Office Lady, what they have to do is very sort of, uh, sexist or whatever, almost like an antiquated idea that doesn't seem to really exist, but it seems to work in Japan, but it doesn't seem like, there's no real North American analogue for that, it's all, what the secretaries in North America are expected to do here is so completely different from what they're expected to do in Japan, so it's an interesting topic, um, it's not what I give too much thought about." (Jim, First interview, 2/4/98)

Unlike their varied reactions to the first topic, the students found the second topic, lecture-based learning, relevant and interesting, since it was such a central feature of their university education. They unanimously stated that their plentiful first-hand experiences and the fact that they thought about the topic made the writing easier and more engaging. To illustrate the students' general reactions toward the second writing assignment, two interview quotations are presented:

"Because we know about the lecture we have lots to say and I wanted to write much more than two pages of genkooyooshi [Japanese composition paper]." (June, Third interview, 4/3/98)

"...Because I'm personally involved...talking about a lecture...just writing my thoughts...I found it easier to write." (Cindy, Second interview, 3/3/98)

For the second writing assignment, the students also mentioned that they had much more time to write because of a one-week study break before the due date. These two factors, their genuine interest in the topic and the time available, appeared to contribute to their producing the lengthiest essays on this topic (see Table 4.13 in Chapter 4).

In sharp contrast to their enthusiasm for the second writing assignment, the students found the third topic, life-time employment, distant and hard to relate to. It was only the two students intending to work in a Japanese company who found the topic personally relevant. Furthermore, they were pressed for time to write this assignment, since it was due at the end of the academic year, when they had many other obligations (e.g., term tests, term papers). The next two quotations from the interviews with Ewan and Edward capture how the students in general felt about this assignment:
It was a topic that I really didn’t have feelings for either way... ...so I just flipped a coin...picked a position...and I just wrote.... ...which made it a little more difficult because I didn’t believe what I was writing...I was writing in support of the idea that people shouldn’t work for a lifetime at a single job and just extolling the virtues of short term contract work...it’s not something I really thought about too...and like I said I don’t really care either way. (Ewan, Third interview, 4/2/98)

This topic was more difficult to write about because I’m not in the workforce...not having direct experience. It might be easier for students to write about things they can understand a bit better. Like when we talked about, when we wrote about the lectures I could use personal experience...peer experience. When you’re writing about work you can use part time work but something like lifetime employment...how do you really understand that concept when you’re 22 years old. You know...life to you is 22 years which is pretty short time...I mean you can’t imagine working in the same company for 50 years...I mean it’s just inconceivable for someone like me so...it was tough...tougher than the last one...the last one...when I got the topic I said yeah...I got some ideas I want to focus and this one it was like...what do you feel about this? I had to think....I thought about it for 20 or 30 minutes before I wrote...just thinking...what do I want to say about this? I had no idea. (Edward, Third interview, 4/2/98)

Thus, there was evidence in the interview data that the students had varying degrees of interest in the three topics, so they approached the production of their first drafts for each assignment differently. It is reasonable to think that due to the students’ general perceptions regarding these JFL essays as opinion-based, the personal relevance of the topic played a significant role in the extent to which they were motivated to write. In addition, the time factor, or how these writing assignments fit into other obligations in the students’ lives, also appeared to influence their text production.

5.3.1. Students’ Perceptions of Conferences and Revisions

The analyses of the students’ perceptions of the conferences and revising indicated that they saw the initial text production as only one of the components involved in the writing activity. As was illustrated in the case studies, when it came to revision, in each case, the students worked diligently to improve their first drafts. Additionally, they reported that their main focus in revision was on language use, although some placed an equal emphasis on rhetorical effect of their prose. Therefore, despite their variable enthusiasm toward the particular topics in the initial text production, the students appeared to approach the task of revision in a very similar manner. It is reasonable to think that the topic effect was neutralized by the other components of the activity.

I now turn to the students’ comments regarding their conferences and revisions. They described how these two components in conjunction helped reinforce their language learning, as each offered different types of learning opportunity. While conferences helped them identify problems in light of their goals and to understand why modifications were necessary and how
they should go about revising, the process of revision helped them to consolidate their linguistic knowledge along these lines. The pre-conference task, an identification, based on careful review of their first drafts, of areas (e.g., specific passages or some general concerns) for discussion in the conference, turned out to be difficult, particularly for the intermediate Japanese-proficient students:

...in most cases I don't even know where my mistakes are....how do you revise them...there are some confusing structures of sentences...grammar mistakes...things like that. (Craig, Third interview, 4/2/98)

More advanced students, who aimed at developing a more sophisticated linguistic style in Japanese, experienced difficulty in finding alternative words or expressions without assistance.

The students found individualized one-on-one instruction in conferences helped them identify areas for improvement--particularly linguistic errors--and through discussing their first drafts they were able to develop understanding why modifications were necessary. What follows are some of the students’ comments on this subject:

This way [having conferences] it's sort of like a learning process instead of just feedback which is like later on they're marked. The whole idea of that sort of forced precision ...it just helps you work. (Jim, Third interview, 4/2/98)

...because usually in the revision [conference] sessions where I've made a mistake it's explained to me why this is incorrect or if it isn't she [the teacher] just says "Oh...this is incorrect."...it forces me to go back to the grammatical dictionary, check it and learn the proper way one more time... (Ewan, Third interview, 4/2/98)

Additionally, they also stressed the importance of going over their drafts for the second time to consolidate their linguistic knowledge:

It takes time to just realize what you're doing and I think through these revisions you do have your full time to digest...to really correct a lot of mistakes you made...and the most important part is after the conference we go through one more time ourselves to check our errors and to get another...a second draft ready...so for that process I think you can really attend to your mistakes and correct it (Chris, Third interview, 4/2/98)

As has been demonstrated, these JFL students, who by and large lacked exposure to linguistic input in the target language, found it difficult to diagnose the linguistic problems in their prose unaided. The students’ comments showed that individualized interactive feedback on their writing, in conjunction with revision, was an effective means of aiding FL learning. Thus, the students considered the three-part writing activity as an integral whole for learning the target

---

44Cindy, an intermediate Japanese-proficient student, reported that she only dealt with the issues raised in her conferences so as not to make linguistic errors in her revised draft: “Because if I revise other things I might make more mistakes” (Third Interview, 3/28/98).
language meaningfully. Although those with advanced Japanese proficiency tended to attend equally to language use and to the rhetorical effect of their prose, a common focus or goal for improvement on the part of all students was grammatical accuracy and vocabulary use; this was true in each component of the three-part activity, but perhaps more so in the conference-revise segments.

5.3.3. Strategies for Composing in Japanese

While the task-induced factors that were examined in the preceding two sections were relatively independent of the students’ target-language proficiency, their composing strategies in Japanese appeared to be related directly to their differential Japanese proficiency. The analysis of their self-reports in the interviews revealed a continuum of strategy use from novice to advanced. In general, the more proficient the students were, the less dependent they were on their L1 (or L2 in the case of bilingual students) in composing in Japanese. As was expected, June was situated at the most advanced end of the strategy-use continuum; she reported no difficulty in formulating ideas, conducting research, and producing texts entirely in Japanese. The others were situated at four different points on this continuum, in rough correspondence with the degree of their Japanese proficiency (see Table 5.3).

However, the presumed match between Japanese proficiency and the particular types of strategy the students used was not straightforward. Jim, a fluent speaker of Japanese with limited exposure to written Japanese in formal registers, was a case in point. He needed to formulate his ideas, to write a draft in English first, and then translate it into Japanese, since he found his Japanese too limiting as a thinking tool. I placed his strategy at the most novice end of the continuum. Another interesting example was Clive, who used more advanced strategies, despite his lower proficiency; his strategy was to make the writing assignments linguistically manageable by personalizing them and writing within his current Japanese abilities.

Most of the students followed a similar sequence while composing the three tasks: (a) generate ideas in their L1 or L2; (b) make mental notes and/or write ideas or an outline in their L1 or L2; then (c) try to compose in Japanese as much as possible, consulting their L1 or L2 upon experiencing some difficulty. I assigned three different points on the continuum (points 2, 3, 4 in Table 5.3) according to the reported frequency of looping back to their L1 or L2 while composing in Japanese. In this respect, the three Chinese students showed interesting patterns in terms of their preferred language(s) for thinking. Cindy and Craig used their L2, English, as a resource for formulating thoughts instead of their L1. Recall that the four Chinese students fell into two groups according to the extent of their literacy activities in Chinese. After their immigration to Canada at the age of 14, Cindy and Craig had rarely read or written in Chinese,
whereas Chris and Clive had maintained active literate lives in Chinese. This may explain why their preferred language of resource differed: it was English for Cindy and Craig, Chinese for Clive, and English and Chinese for Chris.45

Further, the intermediate Japanese-proficient students, who tended to report more difficulty in expressing their ideas in Japanese than those with advanced proficiency, used common coping strategies, such as simplifying the structures, and abandoning segments that were too difficult to write in Japanese (see Uzawa & Cumming, 1989). These students also reported the practice of reverting back to other language sources and performing the mental translations while composing in Japanese. On the other hand, the advanced Japanese-proficient students considered the task of composing in Japanese to be manageable and tended to use their L1 only as a thinking tool. In sum, as a reflection of the diversity, the composing strategies used by the nine participants represented five distinct points on the strategy-use continuum. Although generally speaking these points corresponded to the degree of their Japanese proficiency, there were some exceptions to this common pattern, notably Jim.

---

45Chris stated that he preferred to generate ideas in Chinese, which allowed him to “get into a situation” faster, to make notes in English and Chinese, and compose in Japanese while consulting his L1 and L2 constantly.
Table 5.3. Continuum of Composing Strategies in Japanese from Novice to Advanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported sequences in composing Japanese essays</th>
<th>Students who used the strategy</th>
<th>Japanese Proficiency (JS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Generate ideas in Japanese</td>
<td>Step 2: Make notes in Japanese</td>
<td>Step 3: Compose entirely in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 refers to the most advanced, whereas 5 indicates the most novice strategy. Inter = intermediate

5.3.3.1. tension between the how and the what while writing. The roles played by different languages involved in the production of Japanese texts appear to suggest a process of language integration. The clearest case was Edward, who successfully manipulated the operations involved in composing by using his well-developed writing ability in his L1 to his advantage. His strategy was: (a) to develop his thesis in L1; (b) to recontextualize it and develop supporting points in Japanese; and (c) to compose directly in Japanese, using L1 as a tool for thinking only when he needed to clarify his text intention:

I guess I think I plan, I figure out what I want to say, in English, right, because I usually have an opinion on the subject, and I figure that out in my head, in English, and then once I get a thesis in my head, then I start figuring out my thesis in Japanese, and all my points in Japanese, that I want to put in my paper, so once I get my thesis and my point... I generally focus on trying to, do all the working and planning in Japanese, once I have an idea....uh, for example in this one, when we're talking about lecture study, uh, it's a topic I think about often, so, when I think about it, I don't think about it in Japanese, I think about it in English, so, naturally, I'll just naturally go back to what I've been thinking about, and what I've decided on up to now, and figure out where I stand, and once I figure out where I stand in English, then my focus is how do I communicate this in Japanese, so then I focus on the rest of it entirely in Japanese, and the only time I revert back to English is if I make, if I'm writing a point down, and then I read it, and I'm saying "no, I don't think this is exactly what I want to say", then I'll say "okay what do I want to say in English", so then I'll try to say it in English, and once I try to say it in English it's more clear, and then usually I don't usually need help putting it into Japanese I just need to know, I think it's a lot clearer when I say it in English, and then I can make it clearer in Japanese.

(Edward, Second interview, 3/2/98.)

According to Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), reflective thinking while writing involves a mental dialectic between content concerns (e.g., What do I really mean?) and rhetorical
processes (e.g., How do I say it effectively?). The quoted comments point to Edward's reflective thinking while composing in Japanese. He used his L1 to clarify his text intention so as to negotiate relations between his ideas and his language choices (Cumming, 1990). He made use of his L1 as a thinking tool in order to develop content and text continuously. He also commented that he deliberately made efforts to think in the target language while composing. Thus, Edward made use of his two linguistic resources for different purposes and functions when composing in Japanese.

Similarly, other students attempted to integrate their language resources to produce Japanese texts efficiently. For instance, instead of writing notes in his L1, Ewan started to write directly in Japanese after he developed a mental outline in the L1:

...I find that whenever I've written it out...written down the points in English...I sort of get bogged down trying to go straight from...trying to translate directly from that point into Japanese which is counterproductive because it doesn't really give you proper Japanese. (Ewan, second interview, 3/2/98.)

However, what distinguished Edward and Ewan was the degree of reported difficulty in recontextualizing their ideas in Japanese while composing. This appeared to be directly related to the level of their Japanese proficiency.

Excluding June, the majority of the students reported a tension between the what and the how while writing in Japanese. Due to their limited proficiency in Japanese, they attended more to rhetorical concerns than to content concerns. This can be explained in three ways. First, although they could draw on their well-developed literacy skills to perform higher-order composing operations, the linguistic realization of their ideas in the FL was more problematic and demanded much of their attention. Second, irrespective of their Japanese proficiency, Japanese being a foreign language, the participants had strong concerns with language use. Finally, in contrast to academic essays written in English where the focus is often domain content, they tended to consider JFL essays as a meaningful language-learning opportunity. Thus, it is hardly surprising that they focused on the 'how' while writing in Japanese.

5.4. Summary of Findings for Research Question 3:

To what extent were the students' modes of engagement with the writing activity explicable in terms of their differential proficiency in the target language?

The five mini-case studies, in combination with the additional observations, provided
further support for the key role played by the students' Japanese proficiency in affecting the focus of talk and the nature of interpersonal dynamics in the conferences, the nature of subsequent revisions, and their strategies for composing in Japanese. However, these case studies also showed that differential proficiency alone cannot account for the complexity of the students’ modes of engagement with the writing tasks. Two major categories of factor to consider were the target language proficiency and other factors that appeared to cut across the proficiency difference (see Table 5.4).

First, in terms of target language proficiency, there were two types of contributing factor: the students’ ethnolinguistic backgrounds and the nature of their intentional learning of the Japanese language, particularly in relation to literacy skills. The former tended to be demographic and not under their intentional control. For instance, June and Jim were born into communities where members spoke Japanese. On the other hand, the latter involved intentional strategies for learning the target language: a matter of personal choice. This included learning Japanese in instructional settings such as the class where the current study was conducted, as well as past and contemporaneous exposure to Japanese outside class. As shown in the case studies, the amount and the nature of deliberate efforts made by the students outside class to improve their Japanese language skills was a major dimension on which they differed.

Second, according to the students’ accounts, other situational factors exerted interdependent influences on the students’ differential performance in the activity. These factors can be classified broadly into three: task-induced, linguistic, and individual. The task-induced factors were directly tied to the nature of the tasks, that is to say, the degree of interests in the selected topics and the effect of the conference-revision components of the writing activity on the students’ overall performance. The linguistic factors included the students’ general perceptions of JFL writing and their L1 writing abilities. The individual factors involved personally and culturally nurtured ways of doing things, the students’ distal goals, the time available for each writing task.

Thus, although target language proficiency was found to be the most clear-cut determinant of the students’ performance in general terms, the case-study analyses also showed the crucial role played by other factors, including the personal, task, curricular, and the sociocultural contexts. Additionally, the students’ intentional learning of the target language outside class, particularly in relation to written language, appeared to influence their composing behaviors. Finally, what was highlighted in the qualitative analyses was the complex interaction among the afore-mentioned variables. Interactions appeared to occur not only between the two major categories (FL proficiency and contextual variables), but also across many variables identified.
### Table 5.4. Factors Affecting the Students’ Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main factors</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target language proficiency</td>
<td>Given</td>
<td>Ethno-linguistic backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intentional</td>
<td>Intentional learning of the target language in formal instructional settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intentional learning of the target language outside class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors</td>
<td>Task-induced</td>
<td>Interest in the topics; the effect of the conference and revision components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>Students’ perceptions of JFL writing; L1 writing abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Personal inclinations and values; time available for writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

In this chapter, I discuss key issues arising from the quantitative and qualitative analyses. In the first section, I consider the issues raised by the analyses of the teacher-student interaction in conferences, drawing on discourse theory derived from the framework of systemic functional linguistics. At the end of this section, building on my preceding discussion, I address the issue of 'negotiation of meaning' as defined in the second-language acquisition literature. In the second section, I examine the issues arising from the analyses of composing and revising in terms of the immediate context of writing. Finally, I attempt to reconstrue an overall picture of the writing activity in the light of cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT).

6.1. Issues Raised by the Analyses of the Discourse in Conferences

Studies in discourse and conversational analysis have shown that social interaction involves participants’ simultaneous attention to multiple dimensions in the ongoing talk, such as interpersonal dynamics, topic development, and discourse management (e.g., Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Brown & Yule, 1983; Button & Casey, 1984; Duranti & Goodwin, 1992; Gumperz, 1982; Sacks, Scheglof & Jefferson, 1974). What makes the study of face-to-face interaction interesting yet challenging is its complexity, as it involves simultaneous layers of meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal communicative means. This intricacy certainly applies to the discourse data in the current study. The richness of the discourse, however, necessitates a careful delimiting of my analytical focus for discussion. Thus, I focus on two main issues raised in the analyses of the conference discourse: (a) the indeterminacy of discourse contributions; and (b) the organization of discourse. Finally, in light of an examination of these issues, I consider some implications for pedagogy and theory.

In considering the range of different kinds of discourse in general, it may be helpful to conceive of it as a continuum. On the one end are rigidly conventionalized discursive practices such as court transactions where one party (i.e., the judge) has a monopoly on power. Situated quite close to this end, although less rigid than the first example, is a particular form of the I-R-F exchange found to be common in certain settings such as classrooms (e.g., Lemke, 1990;
Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). This exchange structure is also referred to as "triadic dialogue" (Lemke, 1990). It is characterized by non-extended talk and the closed nature of role-taking; the exchange starts with teacher initiation (often asking a known information question), is followed by student response, and frequently concludes with teacher evaluation. In contrast, situated at the other end of the continuum is casual conversation, where meanings are co-constructed by participants, turn-taking is open-ended, and the power is more democratically distributed among interactants. In this respect, the current discourse data were located somewhere between these extreme ends. The analyses of the discourse revealed neither the rigid pattern of triadic dialogue nor the open-ended nature of casual conversation. This concurs with Freedman and Katz's (1987) findings. As a type of instructional conversation, the conference discourse typically followed the I-R-F pattern, Initiate-Respond-Follow up. However, unlike triadic dialogue where the third move evaluates the student response, in the conference discourse, the third move tended to serve the function of extending the ongoing talk rather than bringing it to closure, as evidenced by the mean sequence length being more than three exchanges. Additionally, there was evidence of variation in this I-R-F pattern, in which the teacher and the students engaged in phatic communication (Malinowski, 1923) to build rapport, as in casual conversation.

6.1.1. Indeterminacy of Discourse Contributions

In oral interaction, one cannot assume an uncontested direct mapping between the grammatical form and the discourse function. As Halliday's three-level interpretation of dialogue shows, the discourse patterns of speech function realize the social-contextual options of role assignment and commodity exchange. When discursive practices are situated closer to casual conversation on the continuum, the social-contextual options become increasingly open-ended, which in turn results in increased indeterminacy of discourse contributions. When coding the discourse data, we need to take account of this indeterminacy and attend minimally to

---

46 Researchers use different terms to refer to the same phenomenon. Mehan (1979) calls it the I-R-E sequence: teacher initiation followed by student(s)' reply, which gets evaluated in the third move. Lemke (1990) calls it triadic dialogue. British researchers such as Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) use an umbrella term, the I-R-F (initiation-response-follow up). The third move is called "follow-up", since in their corpus, it was found that the third move served functions other than evaluation.

47 In this respect, the contribution of speech act theory, as developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1979), should be noted. Recognizing that an utterance has 'sense' (what is said) and 'force' (what is meant), these theorists introduced the notion of the illocutionary force of speech acts. The identification of the speech act, or the illocutionary act, allowed other researchers (e.g., Labov, 1970; Labov & Fanshel, 1977) to address the lack of a one-to-one match between discourse function (illocutionary force) and grammatical form.
three factors in concert: (a) context; (b) non-verbal cues and intonation; and (c) discrepancy between a speaker intention and a respondent’s uptake.

It is undeniable that the context selects the register of the discourse; different contexts select different types of discourse structure. Writing conferences in this study involved two sources of legitimation for unequal status relations (see Poynton, 1985). One is authority (teacher-student relations) and the other is expertise (teacher being an expert in the target language). Given these built-in power relations, it is hardly surprising that the conference talk took the form of instructional discourse, evidenced in the I-R-F exchange pattern. More specifically, the instructional setting was a foreign language classroom, in which such features as silences, hesitations, and restated sentences—described as characteristics of less successful writing conferences in the L1 setting (e.g., Newkirk, 1995, p.213)—can be re-contextualized and re-interpreted as strategic moves on the part of the students to compensate for their lack of fluency in the target language and to continue the conversation. Similarly, the teacher’s restatement, or reformulation of her initiation moves, can be seen pedagogically as an effort to make the language comprehensible to the students.

Intonation and paralinguistic features played an important role in coding the utterance. For instance, in the current data, the expression *Ah soo desu ka* (Is that so?; Oh really?) was one such example. With rising tone, it was used to initiate a dependent exchange, demanding justification, whereas with falling tone, it was used to acknowledge the previous utterance.

Another factor contributing to the indeterminacy of discourse contributions is that the respondent’s uptake can diverge from the speaker’s intention. Consider the following short excerpt from Edward’s conference:

Edward Task #2, Sequence 8

107 T: *Un, sorede saisho no bubun wa sugoku iiina to omotta n desukedo, kono futatsu no bun no tsunagari ga yoku wakaranakatta n desu yo ne... Nantonaku wakatta yoon ka i wa suru n dakedo, koko de tomodachi no hanashi ga detekurudesho, dakara tsunagari ga yoku wakaranakatta n desu yo ne* (Well, then, this part um I thought the first part was really good, but I couldn’t figure out the relationship between the two passages here. I managed to make sense of the connection, but here you mention about your friends, well, that’s why I had difficulty understanding the connection, you see?)

108 S: *Dakara nante ieba yokatta n desu ka?* (So what should I have said first there?)

In turn 107, the teacher demands explanation by using the sentence-ending particle *ne* in “yoku
wakaranakatta n desu yo ne’’ (that’s why I had difficulty understanding the connection, you see?), inviting Edward to elaborate. While acknowledging the teacher initiation, instead of providing an expected response, he initiates a dependent exchange that demands a suggestion from the teacher.

6.1.2. The Organization of Discourse: Sequential Chaining

As noted earlier, the conference discourse, as a type of instructional conversation, followed the I-R-F exchange pattern, but its turn-taking rules were not as rigid as those found in triadic dialogue (e.g., Lemke, 1990). In fact, there was fluidity in the participants’ turn-taking behaviors, though not as open-ended as those found in casual conversation (e.g., Sacks et al., 1974). This fluidity appeared to contribute to extending the talk, as evidenced by the mean sequence length (MSL) being 3.54 exchanges. The question is what created the fluidity and relatively long sequences of talk. In this section, I consider the organization of the conference discourse in terms of how the two dimensions of move type are interdependent.

As more generally, in the current study, extended talk was made possible through the management of prospectiveness; by raising the level of prospectiveness beyond that which was predicted, participants set up an expectation for a further move. The choice of prospectiveness maps onto the turn-taking framework or sequential organization of the discourse, as participants negotiate their turns to fulfil their interactional purposes. As was noted in Chapter 2, there are three options available to conversational participants to raise the level of prospectiveness: (a) making a G+ move through the use of a tag (e.g., an affective particle ne in Japanese) or rising pitch movement; (b) minimally fulfilling the requirement set up by the the previous move and initiating a new exchange in the same turn; and (c) using a pivot move that both involves an implicit realization of the expected move and initiates a new exchange. Each of these three options will be illustrated and discussed in the following subsections in relation to the current data.

6.1.2.1. devices for linking exchanges: examples from the conference discourse. To show how the teacher and the students managed prospectiveness to extend the conference talk, I revisit three conference excerpts presented in the case-study chapter. In each instance, while following the norms of conversation, the respondents took over the conversational floor (Sacks et al., 1974) by raising the level of prospectiveness, hereafter referred to simply as “raising”. In the first example, the teacher, in the follow-up slot, consistently makes two moves: an Acknowledge move and then a Demand or Give+ move to push the student to clarify his intended meanings. The second example shows how the student agentively uses “raising” to initiate dependent exchanges so that he can put forward his own point of view. The third
exemplifies how the student with low Japanese proficiency uses "raising" to practise language form.

The first example, a segment of a sequence focusing on gist, is taken from Edward's second conference session. By using "raising", exchanges are linked in turns 87, 89, 91, and (92b) 94. The teacher, in turns 87, 89, and 91, consistently utilizes "raising" in follow-up slots to start new exchanges. For instance, in turn 91, after making an acknowledge move, the teacher summarizes, gives further comments, and initiates a dependent exchange with a Give+ move. "Raising" is realized by the sentence-ending particle ne (equivalent to a tag in English in this context). Similarly, Edward utilizes this mechanism in turn 92b and 94 to initiate a dependent exchange to comment on the teacher's utterance.

Example 1: Edward Task 2, Gist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Exch</th>
<th>Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Ano... Dainidanraku no hajime to daiichidanraku ga doo tsunagatte iru no ka chyotto setsuumeeshite moraemasu ka? Tsunagari ga chotto yoku wakaranakata node (Um...Can you talk a bit about how the beginning of the second paragraph relates to the first paragraph? The link between the two is not all that obvious to me)</td>
<td>Nucl</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Demo ano aru jyugwoo de wa, ano- koogi o tanoshimu koto ga dekinai to watashi wa omoimasu (um well you see in some classes, I don't think students can enjoy lectures)</td>
<td>Nucl</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87a b</td>
<td>A, (Oh,) soo desu ka? (really?)</td>
<td>Nucl</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Jyooohoo ga annari ni mo ookute ano- kichinto nooto o kakanai a. to ..&lt;seikoo&gt; dekinai Dakara lutatsu no koto shinakereba naranai Dakara hitotsu wa ano- daigaku wa curriculum o chotto kaeta hoo ga ii, dakara ano kokoni kaita kedo ano-..hitsuuyoon .a jyooohoo wa zenbu kyookasho ni kaite-aru kara, jiban de benkyoo dekiri. Demo omona point wa koogi de ano- ma discussion mitaina kanji de shita hoo ga ii desu ne De, ano-...sono ano ippo? Gakusei wa ano- ano. ano kono jyugyo tanoshii tanoshimu to yii kangaee kata de class ni itta hoo ga ii to omoimasu (When too much information is given, students have to take notes diligently, um. otherwise we cannot succeed, so um as I wrote here um the necessary information should be in the textbooks. But main points should be dealt with in the lecture through discussion. um,... Well, um. on the other hand? Students would be better off if they go to a class thinking they should enjoy it)</td>
<td>Embl</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89a b</td>
<td>A, (Ah,) tairitsuda te omowanakute? (you mean not going into lectures, thinking they are boring?)</td>
<td>Dep1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Soo desu. Hai (Yes, that's right)</td>
<td>Emb2</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second example, a sequence dealing with discourse organization, involves Clive. Recall that Clive typically expressed himself cogently with minimal verbalization. The ways in which he uses “raising” in this sequence appear to reflect his interactional style. In turn 6b, Clive does “pivoting”. That is to say, he implicitly realizes the expected move and initiates a new exchange in the same move, evaluating his writing and asking for agreement. In turn 8b, he makes an explicit acknowledge move and starts a new exchange using “raising” to give suggestions for revision. The teacher also makes use of “raising” in turn 7.

**Example 2: Clive Task 1, Discourse Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>k2</th>
<th>Jyaa, ichidanraku goto mitekimashoo ka. Shitsumon ga attara dondon shitekudasai ne. Sorekara, nanika hanashitai koto ga attara, itekudasai ne. Eeto, daiichidanraku to dainidanraku wa ii desu ka? Koko de kuraibu-san no ittai koto wa ano jyosei ga shigoto-suru no ni wa sansei tte iu koto desu yo ne Unn (Let’s take a look at one paragraph at a time, shall we? If you have any questions, just go ahead and talk about them. Well how about the first and second paragraphs? Your general point here is um that you are supportive of women’s participation in the labor force, isn’t it? um)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nucl</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>G+</td>
<td>Sum Form Conf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6a</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>k1</th>
<th>k1</th>
<th>A, kono danraku wa mijikasugimasu ne Moo sukoshi setsuseishita hoo ga ii desu ne (This paragraph is way too short, isn’t it?) Moo sukoshi setsuseishita hoo ga ii desu ne (I should explain more, shouldn’t I?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nucl</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(Conf)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>G+</td>
<td>Eval Conf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third example, a segment of a sequence dealing with language use, illustrates the ways in which the student with lower Japanese proficiency utilizes “raising” to practise language form. In turns 200b and 204b, Chris initiates embedded exchanges to express a small chunk of his intended meanings in Japanese and simultaneously requests the teacher to assess his performance. In turn 205b, in the follow-up slot, the teacher gives direct instruction in the form of a recast and uses “raising” by stressing the correct from that she wants Chris to master.

**Example 3: Chris Task 2, Language Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Action/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>“kanada no daigasei no sekatsu wa” [reading the passage in the first draft], sekatsu ga shimpai-suru n desu ka? (“university students’ life in Canada” Is it life that worries?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>It’s...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Dare ga shimpanshite-iru n desu ka? Who is worried?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Aa- daigasei (Ah, university students) Kanada no daigakusei wa [topic-marking particle]? (Canadian university students?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201a</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Soo desu ne (Right) Sorede, kadada no daigakusei wa nani nan no koto o shimpanshite-iru n desu ka?..(um...uh, what , what are these Canadian university students worried about?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Un... (Um...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Seiseki desu ka? Soretomo daigakuseikatsu no koto? (Their grades or their life in university?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>their life in university um daigakuseikatsu O [object-marking particle]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205a</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Soo desu ne (Uuhuh) De kanada no daigakuseei wa, daigakuseikatsu NO KOTO O (Canadian university students are [worried] about)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Hai daigakuseikatsu no koto o shimpaisihmasu (Yes they worry about their university life)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As these three examples show, both the teacher and the students are oriented towards meeting the norms of conversation in the language community, yet at the same time they are oriented towards fulfilling their interactional purposes. The main device for sequencing moves to negotiate interactional purposes is the management of prospectiveness. Within a sequence, at any point after the nuclear initiation, the participants use the “raising” strategically. Seen in this way, the linking of exchanges is a purposeful action.

6.1.4. The Organization of Discourse: Choices on the Paradigmatic Dimension

In the previous section, I have illustrated that turn-taking behaviors in the conference were more fluid than those in triadic dialogue on the syntagmatic dimension. In this section, I shift my focus to the paradigmatic dimension, which concerns the set of options from which choices are made at each sequential position. Viewed from the framework of systemic theory, these options are available to participants at each level of the rankscale (context-semantics-lexicogrammar-phonology). However, as noted earlier, my focus is on speech roles and speech functions at the levels of the context of situation and semantics.

I start with the types of speech role that were prominent in the current data. The three roles identified as particularly important were:

1. exchange roles (who initiates and responds);
2. primary knower (who has access to the knowledge at issue; who sanctions the knowledge as appropriate or acceptable); and
3. role as tutor.

6.1.4.1. the role of the teacher as tutor. As Halliday notes, at the social-context level, “the dynamics of dialogue consists in assigning, taking on and carrying out a variety of speech roles” (1984, p.11). This general principle certainly applies to the three afore-mentioned roles, but rather differently to the third one. Evidently, the tutor role is only available to the teacher; it exists independent of the conference and therefore is superordinate to the others. Typically, only the tutor has the privilege of initiating a new sequence, but either party can initiate bound exchanges within a sequence in the present study. The teacher’s role as tutor had a significant bearing on the overall texture of the discourse, evidenced by the tendency for sequences to be initiated by the teacher and for the participants to follow the I-R-F exchange pattern.

Recall that social-contextual options represent intersections of the choices in role-
assignment and in commodity exchange. What this entails is that the initiator of an exchange in conversation needs to make a double choice: what role(s) to take on and what type of commodity to exchange. The commodity exchanged in the conferences was primarily that of 'information', but choices were still available as to what subcategories of information to request. Therefore, it is not simply the quantity of initiation moves but also the manner of initiation that is important.

In the role of tutor, the teacher can set up different types of expectation to be fulfilled by the respondent through soliciting different subcategories of information. In the current data, four types of teacher initiation moves were identified. Table 6.3 summarizes how this framework looks when applied to the three conference excerpts presented earlier.

As shown in Table 6.3, the subcategory of information that the respondent is expected to give is dependent on the type of teacher initiation move. This, in turn, anticipates the degree to which the respondent is asked to contribute: substantive or confirmatory. Thus, we not only need to examine the proportion of teacher initiation moves but also to look at the functions that they serve in the moment-by-moment interaction, the types of learning opportunities that they create for students to take up, and whether these opportunities meet the purposes and goals of the activity.

**Table 6.1. Four Types of Teacher Initiation Moves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of teacher initiation moves</th>
<th>Examples from the 3 excerpts</th>
<th>Subcategory of information</th>
<th>Type of info. expected in response</th>
<th>Degree of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 requires a clausal proposition</td>
<td>Dainidanraku no hajime to daiichidanraku go doo suragatte iru no ka chyotto setsumeishite moraemasu ka? (Can you talk a bit about how the beginning of the second paragraph relates to the first paragraph?)</td>
<td>Explanation Opinion Justification Specification etc.</td>
<td>substantive</td>
<td>substantive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 requires identification</td>
<td>Dare ga shimaishite-iru n desu ka? (Who is worried?)</td>
<td>specification</td>
<td>substantive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Requires choice between alternatives</td>
<td>Sensei desu ka? Soretomo daigakuseikutatsu no koto? (Their grades or their life in university?)</td>
<td>choice</td>
<td>choice</td>
<td>confirmatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 requires confirmation or disconfirmation</td>
<td>Taikutsu tfe omowanaku tte (You mean not going into lectures, thinking they are boring?)</td>
<td>confirmation; disconfirmation</td>
<td>confirmatory</td>
<td>confirmatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All the examples, taken from the current data, were translated from Japanese to English.
6.1.4.2. exchange roles and knower roles. Sequence initiation typically fell within the purview of the teacher as tutor. However, thereafter, the students frequently took on the role of initiator in embedded exchanges, as was explained in Chapter 4. While the teacher’s role as tutor is fixed, exchange and knower roles are not. At any point after the nuclear initiation, there is equality with respect to the range of choices available to all participants within a sequence. It is this equality that sharply distinguishes the conference talk from triadic dialogue. Both exchange roles and knower roles are negotiated in each exchange. For example, as reported in chapter 4, students taking the role of initiator tended to increase in dependent exchanges (development of the initiated topic) and more dramatically so in embedded exchanges (repair negotiation). Additionally, there was evidence that their greater Japanese proficiency enabled the advanced Japanese-proficient students to access and use a wider range of discourse options (e.g., initiating dependent exchanges with Give moves to request substantive responses from the teacher). These results suggest that options in terms of exchange roles, knower roles, and the commodity to be exchanged (i.e., subcategories of information) were potentially available to all participants.

The role of initiator is significant, since the initiator not only assigns the co-participant(s) a complementary exchange role but also selects one of the knower roles for himself/herself, thereby assigning a reciprocal knower role to the respondent. Thus, in addition to the importance of the manner of teacher initiation moves that I discussed earlier, we need to consider whether initiation moves are made in the capacity of K1 or K2. Recall that in triadic dialogue, it is the teacher who initiates exchanges, frequently asks students known-answer questions, and evaluates their responses. Clearly, the teacher not only has the sanctioned knowledge but also the authority to evaluate and ratify the knowledge produced by students. In sharp contrast, in the conference discourse, there was a distinct tendency for the teacher to adopt the role of K2 when initiating nuclear and dependent exchanges. She tended to cast the students in the role of K1 respondent who was expected to make substantive contributions. This is evidenced by the high proportion of exchanges where the students were K1 (more than 50%). Generally, the students contributed much more frequently as K1 respondent than as K1 initiator, and of those student contributions as K1 respondent, 50% were substantive. However, qualitative differences in the frequency and nature of the students’ K1 contributions were found between the two proficiency-based groups. That is, as compared with the intermediate students, the advanced students initiated more in the role of K1 and were not as frequently cast by the teacher in the role of K2, in which the speaker is expected to give confirmatory responses. Put differently, increased Japanese proficiency appeared to enable the students to proactively assign themselves the role of K1 initiator and thus to control the flow of the information.

Although embedded in the teacher-student relations, there was considerable latitude as to
who took on the role of K1. It should be noted that what is not set up by the initiation moves is the follow-up move, whose function is relatively independent and thus optional. As shown in the previous sections, the teacher used the follow-up move to push the students to clarify their intended meanings and to provide corrective feedback. In the context of this study, what facilitated the students in initiating in the K1 role and what prompted the teacher in requesting fewer confirmatory responses appeared to be the degree of target language proficiency and the types of topic field selected for discussion. The issue of topic field will be discussed separately.

6.1.4.3. *speech function.* Speech functions concern the actions taken by the speaker with respect to co-participant(s) and to the topic. In this sense, they are situated at the intersection of interpersonal and ideational meanings. Speech functions map onto sequential positions in the exchange so as to fit the norms of prospectiveness and are realized in lexicogrammar. Selection of speech functions in the moment-by-moment interaction is a complicated matter. As was noted earlier, at any point after the nuclear initiation, participants have a full range of options in initiating bound exchanges.

Like knower roles and the type of commodity exchanged, speech functions are also selected by the initiator. In selecting the speech function of the initiation move, the initiator typically sets up an expectation for the function of the immediately following move (c.f. adjacency pairs). What is apparent, therefore, is that as compared with the initiator, the speaker assigned the respondent role is constrained with respect to the functions s/he can select. What relieves this constraint is the possibility of the respondent raising the level of prospectiveness of her/his response move and of initiating a new exchange, thereby constraining the functions from which the respondent can choose.

6.1.5. *Topic Field*

In addition to the syntagmatic and paradigmatic dimensions, the topic focus in each sequence of discourse needs to be taken into consideration, in order to fully understand the three simultaneous layers of meaning involved in the discourse. The topic focus (what's being talked about), referred to as "topic field", is part of the register variable of 'field'. A change of field often brings about concomitant changes in 'tenor' (role relations) and mode (the sequential organization of the discourse). The significance of field is that the selected topic allows and disallows who can take on the K1 role, which in turn constrains the options available for the respondent to select on other dimensions.

In the present study, this was certainly the case. The clear pattern that emerged was that when the topic concerned text intention, it was the students who acted as the K1 much more
frequendy than the teacher, whereas when the topic concerned language use, it was the teacher who had the relevant expertise and thus acted as the K1 much more frequently than the students. As was reported in the earlier chapters, the topics selected for discussion closely corresponded to the students' revision goals and their Japanese proficiency level. The advanced Japanese-proficient students had a higher proportion of sequences dealing with text intention than the intermediate students. This, in turn, allowed them to initiate in the role of K1 with give moves to explain their intended meanings. On the other hand, the intermediate Japanese-proficient students had a higher proportion of sequences dealing with language use. This, in turn, had the effect of assigning the K1 role to the teacher. In an earlier section, I noted that, overall, the intermediate students gave a higher proportion of confirmatory responses than the advanced students. This can be explained in two ways. First, in sequences focusing on language use, the results indicate that they tended to give confirmatory responses after the teacher imparted the relevant linguistic knowledge to them. Second, the apparent linguistic constraints, which were manifested in their tendency to give non-elaborated responses in Japanese, may have prompted the teacher to use Give+ moves to provide her interpretation and then ask for confirmation from the students.

6.1.6. Negotiation of Meaning

In the light of the preceding discussion, which pointed to the complex interplay of simultaneous layers of meaning in the conference interaction, I consider the issue of ’negotiation of meaning’ with reference to SLA research. As a point of departure, I summarize the main points of the discussion in terms of Halliday’s three metafunctions (see Table 6.2). Recall that, in this framework, language is seen as a meaning potential and as a network of systems, or interrelated sets of options for making meaning (Halliday, 1994, pp. 15-16). As such, conversation, as a form of exchange of social meanings, is “an ongoing process of contextualized choice” as semantic options are realized in the discourse. Meaning making is dynamic in that a choice made in one metafunction affects options available in others. For instance, in this study, the topics selected for discussion in the conferences had a significant impact on role-taking behaviors, which in turn resulted in particular conversational texture. From this vantage point, ‘negotiation of meaning’ manifests itself in specific realizations in the discourse as summarized in Table 6.2. Furthermore, the features analyzed in the study are by no means exhaustive.
Table 6.2. *Types of Meaning and Their Realizations in the Discourse*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of meaning</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Realizations in the discourse for analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ideational</td>
<td>meanings about the world, representation of reality</td>
<td>commodity (information); topic (e.g., content, language use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>meanings about roles and relationships</td>
<td>role-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• exchange roles (types of initiation moves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• knower roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• teacher’s role as tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textual</td>
<td>sequential organization of the discourse to create textual coherence; coordinates ideational and interpersonal meanings</td>
<td>turn taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• prospectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• I-R-F exchange pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 types of exchange (nuclear, dependent, embedded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section, I consider ‘negotiation of meaning’ from the viewpoint of three types of exchange: nuclear, dependent, and embedded. To recap briefly, the nuclear exchange, and, particularly, its initiating move, proposes a topic (e.g., language use, content) in a sequence and assigns the roles of the speaker and the listener with respect to the topic, either demanding or giving information. Bound exchanges, consisting of dependent and embedded exchanges, resolve any issues raised in the nuclear or subsequent exchanges. The nuclear and dependent exchanges deal with the substance of the talk, whereas the embedded exchange deals with repair, typically when there is some type of communication breakdown. To illustrate how ‘negotiation of meaning’ manifests itself in each type of exchange, I revisit the same segment of a sequence from Edward’s second conference session (see Table 6.3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of exchange</th>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Exch</th>
<th>Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ano... Daimidanraku no hajime to daiichidanraku ga doo tsunagatte iru no ka chyotto setsunee-shite moraemasu ka? Tsunagari ga chotto yoku wakaranakatta node (Um...Can you talk a bit about how the beginning of the second paragraph relates to the first paragraph? The link between the two is not all that obvious to me)</td>
<td>Nucl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Demo ano aru yjuguoo de wa, ano-koogi o tanoshimu koto ga dekinai to watashi wa omoimasu (um well you see in some classes. I don’t think students can enjoy lectures)</td>
<td>Nucl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87a</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A. (Oh.)</td>
<td>Nucl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>87b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>soo desu ka? (really?)</td>
<td>Depl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Jyoohoo ga annari ni mo ooku-te ano- kichinto nooto o kakanai a. to ...&lt;seikoo&gt; dekinai Dakara futatsu no koto shinakereba naranai Dakara hitotsu wa ano-daigaku wa curriculum o chotto kaeta hoo ga ii, dakara ano kokoni kaita kedo ano...hitsuyouon .a jyoohoo wa zenu kyookasho ni kaite-aru kara, jibun de benkyoo dekiru. Demo omona point wa koogi de ano-ma discussion mitaina kanji de shita hoo ga ii desu ne De, ano-...sono ano ippo? Gakusei wa ano-ano, ano kono yjuguoo tanoshii tanoshimu to yuu kangae kata de class ni itta hoo ga ii to omoimasu (When too much information is given, students have to take notes diligently, um. otherwise we cannot succeed, so um as I wrote here um the necessary information should be in the textbooks. But main points should be dealt with in the lecture through discussion. um... Well, um, on the other hand? Students would be better off if they go to a class thinking they should enjoy it)</td>
<td>Depl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89a</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A. (Ah)</td>
<td>Depl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded</td>
<td>89b</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>taikutsuda ite omowanakute? (you mean not going into lectures, thinking they are boring?)</td>
<td>Embl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Soo desu. Hai (Yes, that’s right)</td>
<td>Embl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91a</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Naruhodo ne (I see)</td>
<td>Embl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** T (teacher), S (student); I (initiation), R (response), F (follow-up); D (Demand), G (Give), Ack (Acknowledge); Expl (Explanation), Just (Justification), Conf (Confirmation)
As is shown in Table 6.3, this short segment involves all three types of exchange. In initiating the nuclear exchange in turn 85, the teacher demands an explanation from Edward with respect to his text intention (the proposed topic: gist). In response, Edward accepts and carries out the assigned role. In turn 87a, the teacher quickly closes the exchange and initiates a dependent exchange in the same turn, requesting justification for what Edward said in turn 86. Edward complies in turn 87, giving an elaborated response. The dependent exchange, as shown here, is bound to the topic proposed in the nuclear exchange; it typically accepts the preceding move and either comments on it or asks for further information with respect to the topic under discussion. At the same time, it addresses speaker intention (what the speaker wants the hearer to understand). Thus, in terms of speech act theory, it involves an illocutionary act. On the other hand, the embedded exchange, as shown in turns 89b, 90, and 91a, is not limited to any particular sequential position and concerns the preceding locutionary act (what has been uttered) or the referential act (what is being referred to). It does not typically addresses the illocutionary force, but asks for a clearer re-utterance of what was said in the preceding move. Put differently, the dependent exchange is forward-looking in that it develops the topic forward by adding new information, whereas the embedded exchange is retrospective in that it refers back to the preceding utterance. Clearly, to manage conversational exchange successfully, strategic use of each type of exchange is important, since each has a distinctly different function to perform.

In contrast, the term 'negotiation of meaning' is used very differently in SLA. A substantial body of research has examined 'negotiation of meaning' in task-based interaction, focusing on interactional modifications. Pica (1994, p.494), in her review article concerning research on negotiation in SLA, defines the term as follows:

This term [negotiation] has been used to characterize the modification and restructuring of interaction that occurs when learners and their interlocutors anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility. As they negotiate, they work linguistically to achieve needed comprehensibility, whether repeating a message verbatim, adjusting its syntax, changing its words, or modifying its form and meaning in a host of other ways.

'Negotiation', according to this definition, clearly refers to 'repair negotiation' in the embedded exchange in the current scheme, since its goal is an achievement of mutual comprehensibility, not the development of ideas. In SLA, following Long (1980), particular features of negotiation, such as clarification requests, confirmation checks, and comprehension checks, have been investigated in what is referred to as interactional modification studies. Using particular types of tasks (e.g., information-gap, picture assembly), studies in this tradition have examined repair negotiation, focusing on modification of speech in terms of phonology, lexis, and morpho-
syntax (e.g., Doughty & Pica, 1986; Gass & Varonis, 1984; Long, 1980, 1983). \(^{48}\) Technical terms such as signal and response are used to describe the process of repair negotiation (e.g., Pica, 1991; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989). In addition, it has been argued that the optimal linguistic environment for SLA is rich in these signal-response repair opportunities (the act of non-understanding triggers a response involving repair). Consider the following excerpt as an illustration of the signal-response model:

NNS: . . . you have a three which is . . .
White square of which appears sharp
NS: Huh?
NNS: . . . You have a three houses . . .
One is no- no- not- one is not square, but with a little bit - a small house
(Pica et al., 1989)

The native speaker’s clarification request, “Huh?” , signals difficulty in comprehension, which in turn prompts the non-native speaker to repair the previous utterance. As noted, this is a clear case of the embedded exchange. The meaning negotiated is retrospective as it refers back to what has been said in the preceding move. It contributes to sustaining the discourse by preventing a communication breakdown. However, while acknowledging the importance of such repair negotiation, I suggest that other types of negotiation made salient in this study, including the substance of talk, interpersonal dynamics, and attention to speech act consequences, should be taken into consideration, in order to adequately address the complexity of conversational interaction (see also Aston, 1986; Nakayama, Tyler, & van Lier, forthcoming; van Lier, 1996, 1998).

Several related points should be made. First, the analysis of the embedded exchange in the present study indicates the different functions for which it was used by the two proficiency-based groups. Although both groups used the monitoring function most frequently, the intermediate Japanese-proficient group used a significantly greater proportion of clarification requests pertaining to language (e.g., unknown words) and requests for repetition dealing with general communication failure. By contrast, there was evidence that increased proficiency allowed the advanced students to utilize a wider range of discourse strategies (e.g., initiating dependent exchanges to develop the proposed topic further). Based on this finding, it is reasonable to speculate that ‘negotiation of meaning’, as defined in interactional modification

\(^{48}\)More recently, Long updated his interactional hypothesis as follows: “I would like to suggest that negotiation for meaning, and especially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways” (1996, p. 451-2). Thus, he attempts to examine repair negotiation not just in terms of input but also of other features such as attention and output.
studies in SLA, may be more beneficial for novice learners than advanced learners.⁴⁹

Second, an utterance is "a link in a very complex chain of other utterances" or "a link in the chain of speech communication" (Bahktin, 1986, p.69). Conceived in this way, the production of talk is doubly contextual in that a subsequent utterance not only relies on existing context for its production and interpretation, but the same utterance also shapes a new context for what follows (Heritage, 1984, p.242). This observation certainly applies to the conference discourse. As was demonstrated, in the moment-by-moment interaction, while observing the discourse conventions (e.g. adjacency pairs), the students agentively attempted to achieve their own interactional goals by strategically initiating bound exchanges. Recall that Chris used the embedded exchange to practice language form, whereas Edward used the dependent exchange to elaborate on his ideas. Thus, from this vantage point, the agency assumed by conversational participants is of importance. By contrast, consider the terms used to describe repair negotiation in interactional modification studies in SLA, including signal, response, and the linguistic environment (e.g., Long, 1996; Pica et al, 1989). They conjure up a mechanistic view of language learning that appears to underlie this line of research; this transmissional orientation is akin to what is captured in Reddy’s (1979) characterization of information transmission in terms of the conduit metaphor. As is shown in the present study, however, the students were far from merely receiving linguistic input through the conduit of the teacher’s speech. Rather, they collaboratively shaped the linguistic environment with the teacher in an attempt to achieve their objectives. Thus, each conversational move was built on the participants’ negotiation of meaning.

Third, conversation is a purposeful activity, in that participants have some interactional purposes to fulfil, and it is the negotiation of these purposes that structures particular conversations. For instance, the primary task of casual conversation is "the negotiation of social identity and social relations" (Eggin's & Slade, 1997, pp. 49-50); in other words, it is driven by interpersonal meaning. The task orientation in the conferences is toward ideational meaning, since it was the ideational content of the talk that mattered: discussion concerning how to go about revising the students’ first drafts. In this respect, what type of meaning dominates task-based interaction in interactional modification studies? Considering that the purpose of negotiation is a clearer re-utterance of what was previously said, it seems to be above all a process of repetition or clarification of the locutionary or referential act in the utterance in question. Moreover, it should be noted that repair negotiation primarily addresses no more than

⁴⁹According to Pica (1994, p. 518), the research data suggests that repair negotiation seems to work most readily on lexical items and larger syntactic units, but negotiation over grammatical morphology is rare. Furthermore, despite the proposed link among repair negotiation, comprehension, and acquisition, recent studies in this tradition have not been able to provide evidence that repair negotiation leads to acquisition (Doughty, 1996; Gass & Varonis, 1994; Loschky, 1994).
one small portion of textual meaning.

Fourth, some researchers have begun to suggest an alternative theoretical perspective that stresses the dialogicality of conversation in SLA (e.g., Brooks & Donato, 1994; Donato, 1994; Donato & Lantolf, 1990; Swain, 1995, 1997, 1998a). In her comprehensible output hypothesis, Swain (1985) pointed out the crucial role of language production for attainment of full proficiency in the target language; she argued that learners must be given the opportunity to restructure their output syntactically. More recently, Swain and Lapkin (1998) have suggested a theoretical orientation towards viewing dialogue as both a means of communication and a cognitive tool. Using collaborative dialogue as the unit of analysis, rather than separate units of input or output, they have shown that, when students engage in a joint problem-solving activity that focuses on language form, they try to co-construct linguistic knowledge in an attempt to solve a linguistic problem together. Collaborative dialogue provides meaningful opportunities for L2 learning, since tasks such as dictogloss prompt students to negotiate in three ways. First, L2 students (French immersion students in Swain and Lapkin's research) negotiate to reach agreement about the linguistic issue at hand by noticing the gap in their linguistic knowledge and testing their hypotheses in the interaction. Second, by paying attention to language form, they negotiate co-construction of linguistic knowledge (content). Finally, it should be added that, frequently, in order to complete the task collaboratively, they need to negotiate their interpersonal relationship. Thus, the task orientation in this framework addresses ideational meaning much more broadly than is the case in interactional modification studies. Furthermore, it also addresses other dimensions of meaning.

Finally, as is shown in this study, the students' individual trajectories and a host of other factors created different affordances and constraints for each student. As Halliday (1984, 1994) puts it, the choice in the linguistic code is an encoding of the tripartite structure of the context of situation. To understand linguistic realization, one needs to attend to the larger context in which it is embedded. This issue will be pursued in the last section of this chapter.

6.2. The Immediate Context for Writing

In this section, I consider the actual here and now of composing and revising that

50Swain and Lapkin (1998) argue for the role of collaborative dialogue in providing the occasion for L2 learning, stating that "what occurs in collaborative dialogue is learning. That is, learning does not happen outside performance; it occurs in performance" (p. 321).

51Further, Swain (1998b) also points out the facilitative role of L1 in L2 negotiation, thus extending the notion of negotiation one step further. See also Anton and DeCamilla (1998).
constituted the immediate context for writing. First, I look into the context provided by text. Second, I consider the context for individual writers in terms of factors that affected their text production, ranging from the linguistic resources available to them to their interests in the topic and the time constraints.

6.2.1. The Context of Text

With respect to the context of text, it is important to distinguish between text as process and text as product. Composing a written text involves "a continuous process of semantic choice, a movement through the network of meaning potential with each set of choices constituting the environment for a further set" (Halliday & Hasan, 1985, p. 10). Furthermore, the composing of one section of a text may be proceeding concurrently with the reviewing of the preceding section and the planning of the next. Thus, what has been already written provides context for the emerging text and vice versa. It goes without saying that the text produced is simultaneously a product.

In this study, my analysis was essentially carried out on the products of revision. In the first analysis, revisions as found in the final drafts were categorized according to the data-generated coding scheme. These identified revisions (product) were then carefully matched to what was discussed in the conference sequences as shown in the transcripts (product). However, it should be noted that judgements about the scope of meaning to which the students attended was speculative. Further, given that the process of revision is a key component of the overall action of composing, it can occur at any point in the writing process. It is therefore likely that the students had also made revisions during the production of their first drafts, as has been pointed out in studies on L2 revision (e.g., Gaskill, 1987; Hall, 1990).

Ideally, both the process and product of revision should be addressed simultaneously. In this study, although there was no direct evidence for how the students actually revised, the retrospective interviews provided indirect (albeit anecdotal) evidence for how the students set about revising their texts. From these data, there are grounds for thinking that a singular focus on the physical/material aspect of revision may underestimate what the students were doing while revising; the retrospective interviews revealed that a substantial number of the students composed and revised with a larger unit of text in view than the revision rating suggests. Hence, it is important to distinguish between the revision unit as reconstructed and categorized by the researcher(s) in the product analysis and the attentional unit that the writer was actually tackling in the process of revision. A word-level lexico-grammatical substitution does not necessarily mean the writer's attentional unit was very local. Similarly, it is possible that individual words flagged as problematic or options listed may have triggered substantial changes at the level of
sentence (e.g., Hall, 1990; Raimes, 1985; Zamel, 1983)

6.2.2. The Context for Text Production

To develop a fuller picture of the situated practice of composing, the context for text production should be taken into consideration. This dimension involves diverse situational factors including who the writer is, what/when/in what language s/he is asked to write, what types of assistance are available, and so on. I delimit my discussion to two specific features of the situation found salient in the current study: (a) general and linguistic resources that each student could draw on; and (b) topic knowledge and time available for writing.

With respect to resources, each student had a unique set of tools, including proficiency in the target language, her/his past exposure and contemporaneous use of spoken and written Japanese outside class, and her/his linguistic background. Different configurations of these resources created different affordances and constraints for each student. What was seemingly the same writing task, therefore, was far from identical from different individual writers’ viewpoints, as the contexts of biliteracy in which each student was situated varied widely. For instance, despite his fluency in spoken Japanese in informal registers, Jim had considerable difficulty with written Japanese due to his lack of exposure to the written media in Japanese. Conversely, Edward, whose L1 was dissimilar to Japanese in terms of structure and script felt comfortable with written Japanese because of his constant practice in the modality of written Japanese. In addition, he utilized a computer, yet another resource, to alleviate the demands of production of Chinese characters in writing. On the other hand, for Chinese L1 students, the presence of Chinese characters in Japanese was a distinct advantage. However, their relative lack of fluency in Japanese, as compared with Jim and Edward, created different constraints such as difficulty in manipulating basic lexico-grammar in Japanese. Thus, writing in Japanese can be seen as an instance of “mediated action”, or “agent-acting-with-mediational means” (Werstch, 1998; Werstch, Tulviste, & Hagstom, 1993).

Particular configurations of the students’ resources appeared to result in different strategies for composing. In general, they drew on their L1 writing competency to deal with processes such as idea generation, planning, and organization. Increased target language proficiency was associated with a lesser degree of reliance on their L1 (or L2 in the case of bilingual students) in composing. Overall, the students strategically assigned particular functions to the language resources they could bring to bear on the task. Indeed, composing and revising in a FL was “a strategic action, adapted to the necessities of the task” (Flower, Hayes, Carey, Shriver, & Stratman, 1986, p. 19).
Further, it is the interplay between the individuals with mediational means and other situational factors that creates the particular context for text production at any given time. A combination of two situational factors, topic and time, were found particularly salient in this study. Since the students regarded the writing tasks as short opinion pieces, the personal relevance of the particular topic, in conjunction with the time available for writing, appeared to significantly influence the level of enthusiasm they had in their initial text production. According to the students' reports, all found the second task the most engaging and spent the greatest amount of time on writing the initial drafts. However, although this enthusiasm and the time spent on writing led to an increase in the length of the essays, it did not appear to translate into improved quality of writing, as judged by the external raters. This was somewhat surprising, since previous research suggests that writers, regardless of ability or age, produce more successful papers when they have more topic knowledge in writing or revising their drafts (e.g., Ackerman, 1990; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Kearns, 1990; Tedick, 1990). What was at issue in this study was not so much to do with topic knowledge of specific academic content, as in some of the studies cited, but the personal relevance of the topic. However, how precisely such variables as personal relevance interact with the quality of writing in a FL setting requires further research.

Although the context for composing as described above can be assumed to apply to revising in many respects, there was also a distinct contextual difference between composing first drafts and revising them after the conferences. As has already been discussed in the previous section, the conference discussion was a major facilitating factor for revision. Revising was a case of "assisted performance", with a narrower focus, whereas composing was of a more solitary nature and concerned with a more global focus. In revising their first drafts, the goals that the students set for themselves tended to dominate their attention, since they already had the first draft to draw on. Secondly, they had the specific issues discussed in the conferences as prompts to help them revise.
6.3. Talk, Text, and Context

So far, I have discussed the issues arising from the analyses of the conference discourse and of composing and revising in terms of the immediate context of writing. In the final section, drawing on CHAT, I first discuss the issue of agency further and then construct an overall picture of the writing activity within this framework. In so doing, I take an inductive approach, using some of the key notions within the CHAT framework to help me make sense of the data.

6.3.1. Mediated Agency

A critical feature of human action is that it is mediated by tools and signs, of which the most powerful is language (Vygotsky, 1981a). Human action, including mental action (e.g., reasoning, remembering), is inherently tied to the sociocultural milieu in which it occurs. The relationship between the two is not one of unidirectional causality, but one of dialectical interaction. By appropriating mediational means such as language in the process of carrying out joint activities, human mental functioning is shaped in socioculturally specific ways. Consider "literate thinking" and the genre knowledge that is tied to specific language codes as an illustration. These mediational tools that shape human mental functioning, in turn, reflect and are fundamentally involved in creating and maintaining the sociocultural contexts. As such, "one cannot provide an account of human action without taking its cultural, institutional, and historical setting into account. On the other hand, such settings are produced and reproduced through human action" (Wertsch, 1994, p.203). Hence, a non-reductionist unit of analysis is mediated action, since it allows a concurrent focus on agents and their cultural tools -- the mediators of action:

The essence of mediated action is that it involves a kind of tension between the mediational means as provided in the sociocultural setting, and the unique contextualized use of these means in carrying out particular, concrete actions. In this view, any attempt to reduce this basic unit of analysis to the mediational means or to the individual in isolation is misguided. (Wertsch, 1994, p. 205)

An important point to note here is the irreducible tension between agent and mediational means (Wertsch 1998, p.25). This perspective leads to a redefinition of human agency. In this respect, Wertsch et al. (1993) explicated mediated action in terms of agency. Agency, in their account, is not a property of the individual considered in isolation. Instead, agency extends beyond the skin (Bateson, 1972) in two interrelated ways. First, it is often socially distributed or
shared; it may be attributable to groups rather than individuals. Second, agency is an attribute of the "agent-acting-with mediational-means". This alternative view of agency stands in sharp contrast to a traditional atomistic view that presumes the individual-social antimony (Cole & Wertsch, 1998). Further, the formation of mediated agency involves "the process of taking on cognitive authority and hence responsibility for a task by actively appropriating others' mediational means" (Wertsch et al., 1993, p.349).

From this perspective, the students in the current study can be characterized as agents acting with the mediational means at their disposal. For instance, consider the two ethnic Japanese students. As Japanese L1 speakers, both were fluent in spoken Japanese. However, the mediational capacity of their Japanese resources was distinctly different. June had no trouble in thinking and writing in Japanese due to her well-developed text-based literacy in Japanese, whereas Jim had much difficulty with written Japanese as he lacked exposure to written Japanese. This resulted in Jim relying on English as his thinking tool. Hence, mediational means constrain as well as enable action.

The notion of mediated agency, then, begs fundamental questions as to how one should conceptualize L2/FL learners in their instructional contexts. It naturally leads to a view of L2 learners as agents actively appropriating a cultural tool. It follows, therefore, that it is important to attend to who these individual students are in terms of their life trajectories, the configuration of mediational means at hand (e.g., June and Jim), and their purposes for learning.

In examining human activity, there are options in terms of unit of analysis, depending on one's purpose of inquiry. Wertsch, for one, focuses on the total system from the perspective of mediated action, positing action as a unit of analysis and considering action by groups or individuals. However, the findings of the present study prompt me to further consider the students as uniquely situated within the diverse communities to which they belong: past, present, and future. In other words, while acknowledging the analytical importance of mediated action, the current data also call for an explication of how these separate actions are organized within activity systems and how the differences among individuals came about. To this end, I now turn to activity theory.

52The starting point for this view is Vygotsky's "general genetic law of cultural development". That is, the specific structures and processes of intramental functioning can be traced to their developmental precursors on the intermental plane (Wertsch et al., 1993, p.338). The resulting picture is one of "individuals as group" instead of the "group as individual". As Vygotsky puts it, "humans' psychological nature represents the aggregate of internalized social relations that have become functions for the individual and form the individual's structure" (1981b, p.164). Thus, cognitions are situated and distributed rather than decontextualized tools and products of mind (see Hutchins, 1991; Resnick, Levine, & Teasley, 1991; Salomon, 1993).
6.3.2. Leontiev's Three-Level Model of Activity

The distinction among activity, action and operation formed the basis of Leontiev's (1981) three-level model of activity. The level of activity is oriented to an object, which is the real motive of the observed action(s). It is not determined by the physical or perceptual context in which humans function; rather, "it is a sociocultural interpretation or creation that is imposed on the context by the participants(s) (Wertsch, 1991, p.203). It should be noted that the unit of activity concerns specific real activities as opposed to human activities in general. Leontiev defines an activity as:

the nonadditive, molar unit of life for the material, corporeal subject. In a narrow sense (that is, on the psychological level) it is the unit of life that is mediated by mental reflection. The real function of this unit is to orient the subject in the world of objects. In other words, activity is not a reaction or aggregate of reactions, but a system with its own structure, its own internal transformations, and its own development. (1981, p.46)

The next level of analysis focuses on the unit of goal-oriented action and the third level on operation. Referring to the concept of action, Leontiev explains:

we must keep in mind that any kind of well-developed activity presupposes the attainment of a series of concrete goals...an activity is usually carried out by some aggregate of actions subordinated to partial goals, which can be distinguished from the overall goal. (1981, p.61)

The third level of analysis, an operation, is concerned with the concrete conditions under which the action is carried out. It is through these operations that a generalized goal-directed action is instantiated in real spatiotemporal settings. In other words, actions are realized by routinized operations, dependent of the conditions of action. To summarize, the uppermost level of collective activity is driven by an object-oriented motive; the middle-level of individual (or group) action is driven by a conscious goal; and the lowest level of operation is driven by the conditions and tools of the action at hand (Engeström, Miettinen, & Punamaki, 1999). The hierarchical structure of activity can be schematically represented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Motive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewed from this perspective, the multiple levels of context involved in the current data become prominent. At the most obvious level, the students were involved in the same actions of composing, conferencing, and revising in Japanese, which constituted one cycle of the activity of writing. However, Leontiev (1981) argued that an individual action and a collective activity must
be distinguished, since an action can vary independently of an activity. Consider Leontiev's explication as to why the distinction should be made:

One and the same action can be instrumental in realizing different activities. It can be transferred from one activity to another, thus revealing its relative independence...Assume that I have the goal of getting to point N, and I carry it out. It is clear that this action...can realize completely different activities. The converse is also obvious: one and the same motive can give rise to different goals and, accordingly, can produce different actions. (1981, p. 61)

Applying this framework to the current data, it can be seen that the writing activity, consisting of three writing assignments, had constituent actions of composing, conferencing, and revising. It is also reasonable to posit that the seemingly same writing activities were actions within different superordinate activities for different students (e.g., getting a job in a Japanese company, preparing for an academic career using the target language). That is, the students belonged to different communities of practice and had aspirations to become members of particular communities of practice (e.g., business, academia). Within these larger activity systems, learning to write in Japanese represented an action, or a cluster of actions involving various subgoals, within a given community. Further, in this study, each component of the actions was driven by a conscious goal shared by the students as a group: producing first drafts as best they could, discussing specific features of their first drafts with their revision goals in view in the conferences, and revising in the light of the conference discussions. When engaging with each of these actions, each student operated under different conditions for different tasks. As well, they had different subgoals toward which they operated (i.e., revision goals). The conditions that shaped their goal-directed actions included such factors as the time available for writing, their motivation to write about a particular topic, and perhaps, most significantly, the different production constraints they experienced when operating in a second language in which the fundamental aspects of lexicon, syntax, morphology, and orthography were not yet operating with relative automaticity. In this way, at the level of concrete operation, mediated action unfolded differently for each student. Thus, although the students carried out the same actions, they were realizing different activities and the concrete operations involved in carrying out these actions were different from student to student and task to task.

Leontiev's three-level model of activity highlights the hierarchical structure of activity. The distinction among activity, action, and operation is made taking into consideration the

---

53Note that during text production, when automatized operations require conscious attention, they go back to the level of action as they are driven by a conscious goal. Thus, the lines between action and operation are not clear-cut. Consider one of Edward's strategies for composing. Although he was able to mostly think and write in Japanese, occasionally he needed to clarify his text intention. To achieve this goal, he turned to his L1, English, as his thinking tool and as soon as a specific problem was resolved, he went back to Japanese.
objects to which these three processes are oriented. This allows one to take into account the status of the behavior in question: whether it is oriented to a motive, a goal, or actual conditions (Kaptelinin, 1996). This differentiation allows one to address how the differences among the individual students came about. Notwithstanding its usefulness, however, this framework has similar limitations to those of mediated action, since the sociocultural contexts are not explicated in this model. To address the sociocultural milieu more broadly, I now turn to an expanded model of activity theory, as outlined by Engeström (1990, 1991).

6.3.3. An Expanded Model of Activity Theory

It may be helpful to briefly sketch out the basic model that Engeström’s model expanded. The basic structure of human cognition resulting from tool mediation has been traditionally pictured as a triangle within this theoretical framework (Cole & Engeström, 1993; Luria, 1928). The left-hand of the base represents “subject” (individuals) and the right-hand of the base “object” (that which the activity it directed to); interactions directly between subject and object are “natural” (unmediated) functions. On the other hand, when the aforementioned interactions are mediated by an auxiliary means, or a “mediating artifact”, shown at the apex of the triangle, they are “cultural” functions.

In this basic model, the collective nature of human activities, or activity systems (Leontiev, 1981), remain unaccounted for. To address this concern, Engeström’s expanded mediational triangle (1990, 1991) that provides a conceptual map of an activity system. As shown in Figure 6.1, the basic triangle is subsumed at the top, and the elements of the broader sociocultural context in which mediated action occur are added at three separate points along the base of the expanded triangle. The fact that individuals (“subject”) are constituents of human activity systems is indicated by the point labelled by “community”; it consists of individuals and/or groups who share the same general interest. As depicted in Figure 6.1, the relations between “subject” and “community” are, on the one hand, mediated by “tools” (resources) available within a given community and on the other hand, by its “rules”. “Rules” refer to explicit norms and conventions that specify and regulate the expected procedures and acceptable behaviors within the community. Inclusion of communities, in turn, denotes some type of “division of labor”, involving “the continuously negotiated distribution of tasks, powers, and responsibilities among the participants of the activity system” (Cole & Engeström, 1993, p.7). The “object” refers to the physical object or problem space at which the activity is directed and which is formed and transformed into the “outcome”.

In applying this expanded mediational triangle to the current data, my analytical focus is
on each of the constituent actions of composing, conferencing, and revising within the writing activity. I attempt to reconstrue each action in relation to the expanded mediational triangle so as to take account of the sociocultural situatedness of these goal-oriented actions.

**Figure 6.1. An Expanded Model of Activity Theory**

6.3.3.1. **phase I.** In the first phase, the student (subject) was engaged in the action of composing the first draft (object). The rules and division of labor that constrained and guided the action of composing were the same for all students. They were each individually responsible for completing the first draft (division of labor) and they composed guided by the attendant rules, including task requirement, date due, the length required, conformity to writing conventions in Japanese. However, in relation to the mediational tools and the community, the students differed. The tools for composing included target language proficiency, L1 writing abilities, topic and genre knowledge of the required task, various dictionaries and, for some, the use of a Japanese word processing program. The minimal unit of community was the JFL class, but for some students, it also included communities of practice in which the Japanese language was the medium of communication (e.g., friends or family in the local community or elsewhere). Recall that all the advanced students had access to these communities in various aspects of their lives, whereas for the majority of the intermediate students, the JFL class alone was the community. This, in turn, gave the advanced students a wider range of mediational tools.
to draw on from the community resources. Consider Jim utilizing his family as a living dictionary to complete his composition.\textsuperscript{54}

6.3.3.2. phase 2. The second phase was the action of conferencing. The teacher and the student, sharing the subject position, worked together on the first draft (the outcome of phase 1 and object in phase 2) to produce specific pointers for revision (outcome of phase 2). In this phase, the conference discourse, which took place in a micro community (the teacher and the student), served as the primary mediational tool. Therefore, the subjects can be seen as individuals acting with the mediational tools at their disposal. In the writing conference, the teacher and the student observed discourse norms (rules) and contributed differently to it in a way appropriate for their different roles (division of labor). However, it should be noted that, in the face-to-face interaction of the writing conference, there was a continuous negotiation with respect to the distribution of power and responsibilities between the participants. The negotiation of role relations was carried out by the participants’ strategic use of discourse strategies (e.g., raising the level of prospectiveness). In this study, the topics selected for discussion significantly affected the role relations, which in turn were closely tied to the students’ Japanese proficiency.

6.3.3.3. phase 3. The third phase was the action of revising. Here, the subject was the student acting with the mediational tools at his or her disposal. The object they worked on was their first draft. The specific pointers for revision arising from the conference talk (outcome of phase 2) served as a mediator in phase 3, when the students engaged in the task of revision. The rules, the community, and the division of labor located at the base of the triangle were the same as in phase 1.

6.3.3.4. the course writing as “action” in a larger context. So far, I have focused on the actual production of the first and final drafts in terms of three phases of action. However, at the next level above, the writing activity in the course can be seen as an action within a variety of different activity systems to which the students belonged in the present and the future. They aspired to become members of various communities in which the ability to write in Japanese played differential roles within the activity systems (e.g., business, academia, maintenance of one’s heritage language).

By virtue of taking the same course, the students shared the same proximal goal for the action of writing, i.e., to become more proficient writers of Japanese prose. During their actual production of text, their target language proficiency contributed to shaping their immediate goals for improvement. On the other hand, the distal goal differed from student to student, depending on what their projected communities of practices were. Hence, the same action of writing in the JFL class was realizing different activities for different students.

\textsuperscript{54} Keith also regularly conversing in the Japanese CHAT room and gaining writing fluency.
Consider Edward as a case in point. He aspired to become a business executive in a multi-national company, where his Japanese language ability could give him an edge. As a first step toward achieving his career goal, he planned to obtain an international MBA degree, where his proficiency in Japanese would be of importance (i.e., meeting a FL requirement in the program). For Edward, therefore, learning to write in Japanese was of pragmatic value for his future plans. Similarly, Clive, who wished to become a business executive in a Japanese company in Taiwan, shared this pragmatic orientation. By contrast, Jim had a completely different goal for learning to write in Japanese. Although in his projected community (teaching in school settings in Canada), he would not be likely to use Japanese, learning to write in Japanese was important for him to maintain his membership in the communities of which he was already a member (family, friends, relatives in Japan with whom he corresponded in the written medium, and the local community of Japanese immigrants). Consider Chris, Ewan, and Cindy. While Chris wanted to become a trilingual medical practitioner (Mandarin, English, Japanese), Ewan and Cindy planned to pursue graduate degrees in Japanese Studies where the target language proficiency played an important role. For Cindy who planned to pursue her graduate studies in Japan, the ability to write an academic paper was of importance. Additionally, the impact of the surrounding university community on the students’ perceptions of JFL writing should be noted. The following quote reflects general sentiments expressed by the students:

...I can learn the macro issues [related to writing] in English, uh, but I can’t learn the micro issues [related to lexico-grammar] in Japanese in English classes, so, that’s why it’s just uh, that’s why I want to focus on micro issues, ‘cause I know once this class is over, no one else is going to be able to teach it to me, so (laughs) I’ve got to get as much as I can out of that, so that’s what I’m focusing. . . the micro issues are something an English professor can’t talk to me about. (Edward, Second Interview, 3/2/98)

The students tended to assign specific functions to the courses they were taking in relation to the learning opportunities available within the institutional context. It may therefore be rather futile to argue over whether FL students are overly concerned with lexico-grammar, as compared with ESL students. Rather, what is at issue is the purpose of students’ FL learning, with reference to the institutional and sociocultural context in which a particular FL class is situated.

6.3.3.5. the nature of the object in the writing practice. In activity theory, it is the motive that drives the activity (Leontiev, 1981). That is, the object (motive) has a motivating force that shapes and directs the activity: it is a self-motivating activity system. For instance, in Engeström’s research, doctors ‘write’ prescriptions for patients within a larger activity system of health care. The kind of writing that doctors do is not an end in itself, but a means to maintain the activities of the health care system. Likewise, there are numerous everyday tasks where
writing plays an important role as a means to achieve specific goals (e.g., writing personal or business letters, making a shopping list). However, in educational settings, learning to write may often be an end in itself. In this respect, Russell's (1995) investigation of first year college composition classes in the United States is important. Using activity theory, Russell analyzed the conflicting nature of general composition courses, questioning both the nature of object (i.e., writing practice being an end in itself) and the semiotic tools that constituted this activity system. What is problematic, he argues, is that writing is not directly tied to the disciplines or curriculum but viewed as a general, autonomous skill, despite the fact that students would be assessed on their writing in specific disciplines and their attendant genres (p. 67).55

The same criticism can be levied against the writing practices in the JFL classroom in which this research took place. However, in university FL education, particularly in relation to less commonly taught languages, enabling students to attain an adequate linguistic ability in the target language is of critical importance. The question to address is how to provide meaningful opportunities for learning to write in the FL, while keeping some visible connection to the activity systems beyond the classroom in which students eventually hope to use writing as a means to achieve their real life goals.

55See Russell (1997) for a comprehensive review of research on writing that draws on activity theory. See also Bracewell and Witte (1997) and Gutierrez and Stone (2000) for research on literacy that draws on this theoretical framework.
CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

In this last chapter, I first summarize the findings for the three research questions. Then, in light of these findings, I discuss the theoretical significance and implications of the current study and its pedagogical implications, including the benefits of adopting the stance of teacher as inquirer.

7.1. Summary of Findings

7.1.1. Summary of Findings for Research Question 1: What factors influenced the content of the talk and the patterns of interaction in the teacher-student conferences?

There was a complex interplay of simultaneous layers of meaning in the conference interaction, involving ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings (Halliday, 1994). The participants made contextualized choices in every move of the conversational exchange; the process of meaning making was dynamic in that a choice made in one metafunction affected options available in others.

First, the factors that influenced the types of topic selected for discussion in the conferences were closely related to the students' revision goals, which in turn reflected their levels of Japanese proficiency. While the intermediate Japanese-proficient students were primarily concerned with language use issues, the advanced Japanese-proficient students were concerned with the ideational content and rhetorical effects of their prose as well as with language use.

Second, in terms of patterns of negotiation, the topics selected in the conferences had a significant impact on role-taking behaviors. Exchange roles (initiator or respondent), knower roles (primary or secondary knower), and the teacher's role as tutor shaped role relations in the domain of interpersonal meaning. In the superordinate role of tutor, the teacher tended to initiate nuclear exchanges more frequently than the students did. However, as respondents the students contributed extensively with substantive answers. The modes of their responding behaviors were closely related to the form of teacher initiation moves (i.e., requesting substantive answers rather than eliciting confirmatory responses). Moreover, after the nuclear initiation, there was equality with respect to the range of choices taken up by both participants within a sequence. What facilitated the students in initiating in the primary knower role and
what prompted the teacher to request particular types of information appeared to correspond to the degree of the students' target language proficiency and the topics selected in the conferences. The topic negotiability (Wong, 1988) increased in those sequences concerned with the ideational content and discourse organization of the text, whereas there was less negotiating in sequences concerned with language use. As evidence of this finding, the mean sequence length (MSL) of the former was found to be markedly longer than that of the latter. In addition, increased target language proficiency also facilitated the students acting as equal conversational partners with the teacher in the quantity of utterances produced.

Third, as was noted earlier, the selected topics (ideational meaning) affected role relations (interpersonal meaning); this, in turn, resulted in a particular configuration of turn-taking behavior in each conference (textual meaning). The conference discourse, as a type of instructional conversation, tended to follow the I-R-F exchange pattern, but turn-taking rules were neither as rigid as those found in triadic dialogue in classroom settings (Lemke, 1990; Mehan, 1979) nor as open as those found in casual conversation (Sacks et al., 1974). This fluidity appeared to contribute to extending the talk, as evidenced by the MSL being 3.54 exchanges. Target language proficiency emerged as a major enabling factor in affecting the extent to which the students could be agentive, e.g., making more frequent use of the 'raise' in prospectiveness and of Give moves in initiating the exchange. Additionally, as was demonstrated in the case studies, the students' personal inclinations (e.g., being concise, verbose etc.) appeared to influence the sequential organization of the discourse.

7.1.2. Summary of Findings for Research Question 2:
How did the teacher-student conferences contribute to students' subsequent revisions?

2A) What was the nature of the revisions made?

In terms of scope, the majority of revisions made by all students were at the level of group/phrase, but the proportion of 'beyond sentence' level revisions was substantially higher for the advanced group than for the intermediate group. Further analysis of the types of revision revealed that, as compared with the intermediate group, the advanced group produced a markedly higher proportion of revisions concerned with ideational and rhetorical focus. By contrast, the intermediate group produced predominantly form-related revisions concerned with linguistic accuracy. Within form-related revisions, while the advanced group was more concerned with lexis than with morpho-syntax, this pattern was reversed for the intermediate group (nearly half of the revisions were morpho-syntactical).
2B) **What relationships could be observed between the conference discourse and students’ revisions in their subsequent drafts?**

The link between the conference discourse and revisions in the students’ final drafts was examined through a bidirectional analysis, from sequences to revisions (analysis 1) and from revisions to sequences (analysis 2). The first analysis revealed that a high proportion of sequences led to revisions for all students and that the average number of revisions made as a result of the conference discussion did not differ between the two proficiency-based groups. However, not all sequences in which potential revisions were discussed actually led to revisions. The proportion of sequences where potential revisions were discussed without any uptake was much higher for the intermediate than for the advanced group.

Differences between the two groups revealed by the second analysis were even more salient. First, revisions resulting from the conference discourse: While most of the revisions made by the intermediate group could be traced to conferences sequences, the proportion of revisions that could be directly traced to conference sequences was much lower for the advanced group. Second, of all the revisions linked to the conference discourse, the primary form of correspondence found in the intermediate group concerned revisions that implemented conference suggestions in a verbatim fashion, whereas a wider range of relationships between conference discussion and revision was found in the advanced group. The difference was most pronounced in the category of ‘general discussion leading to substantive revision’ in that its occurrence was significantly higher for the advanced than for the intermediate group. Finally, for revisions occurring without conference talk, the revisions made by the intermediate group were distributed almost equally between language use and content, while those made by the advanced group were predominantly concerned with content.

In sum, the students as a whole utilized the majority of specific pointers offered during the conference negotiation to revise their first drafts. This being said, the ways in which they revised were qualitatively different between the two proficiency-based groups, reflecting the types of topic selected for discussion in the conferences in the light of the students’ revision goals.
7.1.3. **Summary of Findings for Research Question 3:**

*To what extent were the students' modes of engagement with the writing activity explicable in terms of their differential proficiency in the target language?*

The five mini-case studies, in combination with the additional observations, provided further support for the key role played by the students' Japanese proficiency in affecting the focus of talk and the nature of interpersonal dynamics in the conferences, the nature of subsequent revisions, and their strategies for composing in Japanese. However, these case studies also showed that differential proficiency alone cannot account for the complexity of the students' modes of engagement with the writing tasks. Two major categories of factors to consider were the target language proficiency and other factors that appeared to cut across the proficiency difference.

With respect to target language proficiency, there were two types of contributing factor: the students' ethnolinguistic backgrounds and the nature of their intentional learning of the Japanese language, particularly in relation to literacy skills. While the former tended to be demographic and not under their intentional control, the latter involved intentional strategies for learning the target language. As shown in the case studies, the amount and the nature of deliberate efforts made by the students outside class to improve their Japanese language skills was a major dimension on which they differed.

The students' retrospective accounts in the interviews revealed that other situational factors exerted interdependent influences on their differential performance in the activity. These can be classified broadly into three: task-induced, linguistic, and individual. The task-induced factors were directly tied to the nature of the tasks, i.e., the degree of interests in the selected topics and the effect of the conference-revision components of the writing activity on the students' overall performance. The linguistic factors included the students' general perceptions of JFL writing and their L1 writing abilities. The individual factors involved personally and culturally nurtured ways of doing things, the students' distal goals, the time available for each writing task.

Thus, although target language proficiency was found to be the most clear-cut determinant of the students' performance in general terms, the case-study analyses also showed the crucial role played by other factors, including the personal, task, curricular, and the socio-cultural contexts. Additionally, the students' intentional learning of the target language outside class, particularly in relation to written language, appeared to influence their composing behaviors. Finally, what was highlighted in the qualitative analyses was the complex interaction among the afore-mentioned variables. Interactions appeared to occur not only between the two major categories (FL proficiency and contextual variables), but also across many variables.
identified.

7.2. Theoretical Significance and Implications

The research reported here goes beyond previous research in a number of ways, although my interpretations should be considered in conjunction with the limitations of the study (e.g., the small number of students and the length of research being one semester). Nevertheless, as has been demonstrated, the procedures and the perspectives adopted in this study have allowed insights to be gained into the relationship between the conference discourse and the students’ subsequent revisions. In examining the contributions of writing conferences to the development of L2 writing, the present study offers theoretical contributions in the following three areas:

1. exploring writing conference in terms of discourse theory and the ways in which suggestions for revision were co-constructed by the participants in response to the students’ revision goals;
2. exploring overall patterns of intertextual relationship between the conference discourse and the students’ subsequent revisions;
3. taking account of the immediate context of writing as well as the larger socio-cultural milieu in which the writing activity was embedded by framing it in terms of activity theory.

7.2.1. Discourse Analysis of Writing Conference Interaction

The methodological implications of this study should be taken into consideration in future research. First, the distinction between knower roles and the teacher’s role as tutor (or manager) allows conference interactions to be characterized precisely, providing a means of analyzing whose knowledge is valued in conversational interaction. Second, however, as this study focused on a small number of students in one setting, more research needs to be conducted involving L2/FL learners at different proficiency levels in a variety of settings. Third, further research is needed to describe and define more precisely the criteria for pedagogically beneficial discourse in L2 teacher-student interaction, for example, by using such analytical perspectives and procedures as those adopted from discourse theory in this study. Fourth, when the L2 learners are conceptualized as agents of their own learning, as in this study, a redefinition of ‘negotiation of meaning’ in L2 dyadic interaction is called for in future research. That is, both terms, ‘negotiation’ and ‘meaning’, should be conceived more broadly to address
the multiple dimensions involved in the dialogic process of meaning making.

7.2.2. Intertextual Relationship between Writing Conferences and Text Revisions

Even though the purpose of writing conferences is to promote students' writing development in L1 or L2, few studies have addressed the link between conference discourse and subsequent revisions. This may be attributed to the fact that "given the complex and often ineffable nature of human behavior", it is difficult to prove the link in a definitive way (Sperling, 1994, p. 206). Nevertheless, a handful of researchers have analyzed the link in terms of the relationship between the revision of the written drafts and negotiation of revisions in conference (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990) and qualitative description of the relationship between the recurring topics in the conference and the manner of students' uptake in their subsequent drafts (Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997). The present study was another attempt in this direction. It examined the overall correspondence between the two modalities, using a data-generated coding scheme. To further explore this link, a variety of methods for data collection and analysis can be employed, including the use of think-aloud protocols during text revision and revision journals (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999), the linguistic analysis of specific features in the two modalities, and the evaluation of success of revisions in relation to the occurrence and absence of discussion in conference and to the types of revision made. Additionally, there is a need for more longitudinal research to carefully trace the relationship between the development of L2 writing and the types of classroom talk, such as conferencing and peer interaction, that foreground classroom writing activities.

7.2.3. The Perspectives Afforded by Activity Theory

The current study suggests the importance of considering writing activity in relation to the multiple layers of context in which it is embedded: the context of actual text production, the immediate contexts of writing (i.e., shifting situational variables in the classroom), the institutional context, and the broader sociocultural milieu with respect to students' life trajectories and their distal goals. In some writing conference research, contextual factors have been integrated with discourse analysis of conference talk in broader observational methodologies. From a slightly different analytical angle, the current study also addressed the larger socio-cultural context of writing. That is, the writing activity was reconstrued in terms of activity theory so as to take account of the fact that more than one activity system was involved. As Russell's (1995) study of freshman composition classes illustrates, Engeström's expanded model of activity theory may help identify where problems lie within the activity systems in
which writing takes place. Thus, the application of cultural-historical activity theory to writing appears to offer considerable promise for future research. As Bracewell and Witte (1997) put it, directions for future research may be to place the act of writing as an ‘action’ within the larger perspective of the semiotic process that considers the knowledge that writers apply (e.g., task definition). Cole (1995) calls this approach “mezogenetic”, going beyond the typical microgenetic focus within a given activity found in most research.

7.3. Pedagogical Implications

The main pedagogical implications of this study arise from the findings concerning the contribution to students’ writing development made by the introduction of individual text-oriented conferences. Interpreted within an activity theoretic perspective, these findings emphasize, first, the importance of writing as a means of achieving a purpose beyond itself, and second, the complementary roles of spoken and written expression in the development of FL proficiency. A number of related points should be noted: (a) the nature of the object in writing activity; (b) the consequences of the general lack of exposure to the target language; (c) the value of writing conferences to address this gap; (d) the importance of students writing about topics that matter to them and motivate them to communicate their opinions and feelings; and (e) the differentially agentive nature of FL learning.

First, the current study points to the problematic nature of the “object” of the activity of writing in an FL classroom, which is typically writing as an end in itself. This tendency may be justifiable to some degree, since writing to learn a target language and learning to write in it is the major activity in the FL class. However, this study suggests the importance of creating writing activities with ties to external activity systems, such as the local Japanese community, Japanese students on campus, and electronic communities that operate in Japanese. In this way, FL students can engage in writing both as a means and an end in a larger sociocultural context. One must not forget that learning to write is a socio-cognitive act that cannot be nurtured in a social or ideational vacuum.

Second, this study also highlights other problems inherent in a university FL context, particularly in the context of less commonly taught languages such as Japanese. Consideration of JFL writing in the light of the linguistic interdependence hypothesis (Cummins, 1991a & b) clearly brings out the constraints of the FL learning environment. The benefits of bilingualism are usually premised on the assumption that, with “adequate exposure” to the target language and “adequate motivation”, instructional and social contexts will provide sufficient
opportunities for learners to master L2. However, in the FL context (except perhaps for immersion settings), this is hardly the case. For example, in the current study, it was only June, an ethnic Japanese student with a strong text-based literacy, who met this threshold requirement. The majority of the students in the study did not use the target language for communicative and academic purposes (with the exception of ethnic Japanese students), unlike their ESL counterparts in academic settings, whose survival may depend on skillful uses of the English language. Hence, from a pedagogical viewpoint, there is a strong need to increase opportunities for meaningful language production and interaction in the spoken and written modes of the target language. In other words, the aim is twofold: to help FL students develop fluency and accuracy both in everyday as well as in more technical registers.

Third, in considering this twofold aim, the value of writing conferences becomes evident. Several benefits of conferences in FL learning should be noted. They not only help students to attend to the linguistic issues with which they are particularly concerned but also provide opportunities for oral interaction that moves between the everyday and technical registers that are relevant to the topics of their texts. They also enable students to engage in the production of extended texts and to reflect on their language use in so doing. Moreover, verbalizing their intended meanings in the conferences not only helps students with oral expression of their ideas in a technical register but also helps them improve their texts. For instance, Edward's comments show how the act of explaining his intended meanings orally to the teacher prompted him to recognize the gap between what he had meant to say and what he had actually written in his essay:

... when she [the teacher] would say "now what exactly does this mean? I don't really know exactly what you're saying"...right? ...and then I would realize ...oh, this is unclear...and I would explain it to her in verbal form and through explaining to her in verbal form I figured out what happens on paper to make it make it good so I think her identifying what was unclear to her helped big time.

(Third Interview, 4/2/98)

It appears that opportunities for students to express their ideas in sustained spoken language are as important as realizing them in written language.

Fourth, the study leads to the fundamental question: on what model of literacy should FL teachers base their writing instruction? My contention that writing practices in a FL class should be tied to social practices beyond the classroom follows from my sociocultural perspective on literacy. Literacy is not just decoding and encoding written texts, but rather it must include the knowledge of the social practices in which the texts are embedded (Scribner & Cole, 1981). If we take this proposition seriously, what types of classroom activities might facilitate FL students' grasp of the knowledge of social practices in a specific FL? To achieve
this goal, teachers need to adopt an integrated approach to FL instruction, with built-in tasks that require students to engage in simulated social practices in target language (e.g., conversing with FL native speakers on a particular topic), accompanied by sufficient pre-task preparation and post-task practices including writing (e.g., Thomson, 1992, 1995 for exemplary practices in JFL). This is a challenge for FL teachers, since it entails not only organizing task-oriented activities beyond the confines of their classrooms but also having a comprehensive grasp of written genres and how they are tied to social practices as well as an awareness of differences in the structure of written genres across languages.

Fifth, the participating students had unique attributes, including diverse life trajectories, varied ethnolinguistic backgrounds and differing proximal and distal goals for their Japanese study as well as differential familiarity with Japanese. Other situational variables such as the time available for writing and their topic knowledge complicated the picture further. In this respect, Flower's (1994) finding can be meaningfully related to this study. Upon examining college freshman pairs collaboratively working on class-assigned essays, Flower concluded that ultimately what students learn about writing is strongly shaped by their prior knowledge and goals, immediate competing social realities, and not least, the context of doing writing for a teacher. Similar conclusions can be drawn from this study, pointing to the differentially agentive nature of L2 learning. Thus, FL teachers need to consider students' interests, to plan class sessions that provide sufficient opportunities to learn and talk about the particular topic, and to allow for a choice of topic in a given genre.

Finally, in concluding this section, I would like to discuss an implication of a more specific nature. In this study, noticeable differences between the two proficiency-based groups were found in the types of revisions made. While those made by the intermediate group tended to be form-related, those made by the advanced group involved a wider range, that is, form-related and local and global meaning-related, similar to the revision behavior of advanced adult ESL students in the study reported in Cumming and So (1996). This suggests that increased target language proficiency allows FL writers to attend to form and meaning concurrently, provided that they have highly developed writing abilities in a language other than the target language. Beason notes that revisions operating below the global level are often cognitively demanding, despite the somewhat trivializing labels, such as surface-level or micro-structure changes, commonly used in L1 writing research (1993, p.418). However, from the current study, I would add that this is even more the case in FL writing. As Hyland's (1998) study shows, an overemphasis on global meaning revisions at the cost of accuracy is problematic for FL students. In order to nurture the ability to diagnose the nature of the problems in their drafts, which is crucial in carrying out revision successfully, instruction should aim at a well-balanced focus on language form and rhetorical and ideational concerns. In planning writing
instruction that enables learning to occur in FL students’ zones of proximal development, the teacher also needs to consider learners’ specific linguistic needs, as is clearly shown in the current study (see, also, Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994).

7.4. The Contributions of the Stance of Teacher as Inquirer in This Study

In the present study, I have adopted the perspective of situated literacy, that is to say, a perspective that views writers as active agents who negotiate and construct knowledge, and that takes account of the socioculturally situated nature of writing practices. Equally important in shaping this study was my stance of teacher as inquirer. It provided not only a theoretical perspective but also an action perspective that guided my teaching. The perspective of teacher researcher affected the research design, the methods of data collection, and the analyses of the data in this study. Furthermore, in interpreting the findings, I benefited considerably from the in-depth knowledge about the students that I had developed through numerous interactions with them over a long period of time. Teacher researchers are in a privileged position to develop an ‘emic’ perspective on the educational practices in their own classrooms. For instance, the modifications that I made in my teaching, such as the introduction of the writing conferences investigated in this study, would not have taken place had I not adopted this perspective. Along with other research approaches, I believe that teacher research has much to offer as a valid form of empirical investigation into situated literacy, provided that teacher researchers carefully conduct their research in an ethically appropriate manner and for the benefit of their students.
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Appendix A: Letter of Solicitation

Dear prospective participants:

I am writing to invite you to participate in an action research project on writing in Japanese-as-a-foreign language (JFL). As action research, it aims to improve practice for all parties involved. In the first semester, I observed you in class and have come to recognize that more personalized and interactive forms of feedback are needed for your further development as JFL writers. Since the class consists of students with a wide range of Japanese skills, the whole class instruction alone cannot meet your various needs. In order to enhance learning for each member of the class at an appropriate level, in the second semester I plan to incorporate writing conferences into classroom teaching. Conferences are where student writers have an opportunity to discuss their developing texts with the teacher. I believe that your participation in the research will be helpful in your JFL learning. The research is part of my doctoral work at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto.

The study aims to investigate what helps JFL learners to revise their written texts effectively when they have an opportunity to engage in one-on-one writing conferences with the teacher. It also proposes to examine the relationship between the discussion that takes place in the writing conferences and your subsequent revision. As well as helping you, the students, the results of the study should also help Japanese and other foreign-language educators to gain a better understanding of how students revise, what they perceive to be helpful in their revision, and what forms of assistance may facilitate their development as writers.

In the spring semester of 1998, four conferences will be carried out as part of our regular classroom activities: one initial conference for goal setting and three others for the three writing tasks (one conference per task). The conferences will focus on specific features of text, selected by you as goals for revision: one a micro-level goal (e.g., mechanics) and the other a macro-level goal (e.g., discourse organization).

If you are willing to take part in this study, you will be asked:

1. To give permission for four conferences to be audio-recorded;

2. To give permission for me to make copies of your first and final drafts of the three writing tasks;

3. To complete a brief questionnaire asking about your ethnolinguistic background and language-learning experiences;

4. To attend three interviews (one per task) conducted in English, where you will be asked how you decided to make changes in your text by comparing your first and final drafts (by me) and what you perceived to be helpful in conference in terms of revision (by a second researcher). Each interview session will be around 20-30 minutes;

5. To take a widely recognized tape-mediated test of Japanese oral proficiency, Japanese Speaking Test (JST), developed by the National Foreign Language Resource Center of the Division of Foreign Language Education and Testing at the Center for Applied Linguistics in the United States (The testing fee, US $60 per examinee, will be paid by me).

A copy of the JST Examination Handbook will be made available prior to the testing session. As you can see, #1 and #2 will be part of usual classroom activities. Item 3, 4, and 5 are things that you are asked to do if you agree to participate in the research. The interviews are not of a personal nature, but concern your written texts and the way in which you approached your goals for revision. Since the second half of the interview involves your evaluation of what you thought was helpful or not helpful in the conference talk, it will be conducted by the second researcher. In order to ensure fairness in grading, I will not read this set of data until after I submit my course grades in April.
After the research is completed, you will be asked to read and check the appropriateness of my interpretation of the data, in particular, the reconstruction of my interviews with you so that I can ensure accurate representation of what you said and did. In terms of additional time, your commitment is expected to be around 5 hours in total.

Data obtained from you will be used exclusively for the purpose of this research. What you may say or do during the study will not influence your course grade. All the data will remain confidential and anonymity will be ensured by the use of pseudonyms and keeping the location of the research confidential.

Your participation is voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time if you decide to do so. If you are willing to participate in the study, could you kindly complete the form on the next page and return it to me. Please keep a copy of this letter for your files. Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. If you wish to inquire further about the study, I can be reached at the telephone number or e-mail address below.

Sincerely,

Mari Haneda
Tel. #: 962-5885
E-mail: mhaneda@oise.utoronto.ca

Dear Ms. Haneda:

I have read your letter describing the study you are conducting on writing in Japanese-as-a-foreign language. I am willing to participate in the study. I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time and that to do so would not have any negative consequences for my course grade.

Name:__________________________________________________________

Telephone:_____________________________________________________

(Best time to call:______________________________________________)

E-mail address:_________________________________________________

Mailing address:________________________________________________

Signature:__________________________ Date:________________________
Appendix B: Questions for Three Retrospective Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 Core Questions Common to 3 interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you find the topic for this writing assignment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What expectations and aims did you have for this particular writing assignment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the conference talk were helpful for revision of your text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you explain why you thought so? Can you give some examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there any rules and/or ideas that you had learned from the second conference and applied to your revision? If so, can you describe them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of conference talk do you think could be done differently to enhance your learning of Japanese writing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the things that remained unclear even after the conference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of writing did you pay conscious attention to while writing this assignment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Questions for the Second Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What difficulties do you have in writing English essays (if the L1 is not English, please ask composing in the students’ respective L1s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you compare your experience of writing in Japanese with that of writing in English or your strongest written language? What problems are specific to your Japanese writing experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is revising your text helpful in your language learning? If so, how is the act of revising your text enhancing your learning of Japanese?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of text did you pay conscious attention to while revising this assignment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What expectations do you have for your own composition in Japanese?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to add?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Questions for the Third Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you use similar composition and revision strategies for tasks #1, #2, and #3? If different, how were they different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you think the topic influenced the way you wrote? Can you compare your experiences of the three writing assignments from this point of view?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think writing in Japanese helps you learn the Japanese language? If so, can you describe how it helps? Did the process of revision help you learn? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does writing Japanese essays in JFL class differ from writing essays in English for other courses? What is your view of JFL writing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you comment on your overall impressions/experiences of the three writing conferences and participation in the research (i.e., interviews)? In what ways were they helpful/unhelpful? a) conference sessions; b) revision; c) interview sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think having a second interviewer made a difference in the way you answered? If so, in what ways?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Revision Goals and Goal Attainment

(i) Setting up Revision Goals

Conferencing
You will be discussing revision of your written texts (first drafts of each of the three writing tasks) with me. You will set up two goals for revision (one at a macro-level and the other at a micro-level as was discussed in class). Before each conference session, try to identify the items where you feel you need to revise or you are not sure whether you were able to phrase them right in the light of your goals (of course, this does not exclude non-goal related revisions). During conferencing, you don’t need to restrict yourself to exclusively using Japanese. The purpose of conferencing is to help you write in Japanese, not to test your spoken Japanese.

Your goals for revision
1) your macro-level goal
   ________________________________________________________________

2) your micro-level goal
   ________________________________________________________________

Additional Comments are welcome.

(ii) Self-Evaluation of Goal Attainment

Please answer the following questions in the light of the goals you had for writing conference sessions and text revisions.

A) Have you modified your goals?
Yes_______ No_______
If your answer is yes, can you describe your modified goal(s) and why you did so?

B) To what extent do you think you have achieved your goal(s)?
1. your macro-level goal
   5 4 3 2 1
   completely not at all

2. your macro-level goal
   5 4 3 2 1
   completely not at all

C) Can you offer additional comments? Please use the back of this sheet as well.
Appendix D: Profile Sheet

Background Questionnaire and Personal Profile

I would like to thank you for participating in this research and taking your time to fill out this questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire is to gather information regarding your linguistic background and your writing practices in your first and second languages. Some of the questions may sound repetitive since they overlap those you have encountered in the interview session. I appreciate your cooperation.

I. Identification

a. Name________________________________________

b. Age______________

c. Gender: Male________ Female________

d. Major________________________________________
   Minor________________________________________

e. Year: undergraduate: first____, second____, third____, fourth____

f. Country of birth__________________________________

g. Mother tongue___________________________________

h. Any other languages you speak and/or write in________________________

i. Your strongest oral language______________________

j. Your strongest written language____________________

II. Japanese Language Study

a. Describe briefly the history of your Japanese language study. Please respond to each item listed below. From grades 1 to 13, please indicate the grade level clearly.

Example 1: 1994-95, university first-year Japanese course, at University of X, for one academic year (4 hours per week, 26 weeks), all four skills.

Example 2: 1997 July to August, intensive Japanese course in Japan for 2 months (6 hours per day, 8 weeks), all four skills.
b. Have you taken a Japanese language test or have you had your Japanese proficiency assessed?
   No______
   Yes_____ Describe the type of test and the level you achieved and/or the certificate you obtained.
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

c. Have you ever lived in Japan before? If yes, how long, and for what purpose?
   No______
   Yes______ When?
   1) From 19______ How long? ________year(s) and ________months
      For what purpose(s) ____________________________________________
   2) From 19______ How long? ________year(s) and ________months
      For what purpose(s) ____________________________________________
   3) If you could not fully describe your experience of living in Japan, please describe it in the space below.
      ____________________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________________

 d. How do you rate your overall proficiency in Japanese as compared to the proficiency of other students in this class?
    Excellent______, Good_________, Fair_______, Poor_______

e. How do you rate your overall proficiency in Japanese as compared to the proficiency of native speakers of Japanese?
    Excellent______, Good_________, Fair_______, Poor_______

f. Rank your skills in Japanese and put a number in the blank (1=strongest to 4=weakest)
    Speaking_____ , Listening______ , Reading______, Writing______

g. How important is it for you to become proficient in Japanese?
    Very important____, Important_______, Not so important____

h. Why do you want to learn Japanese (Check all that apply)?
interested in the language  
interested in the culture  
have friends who speak Japanese  
required to take a language course to graduate  
required to take a Japanese course for a degree requirement  
need it for my future career  
need it for travel  
family or cultural heritage  
to study in Japan  
to work in Japan  
other (list): 

i. What has been your favourite experience in learning Japanese?

j. What has been the most productive experience in learning Japanese writing? Can you explain why you think so?

III. Writing in Japanese

Please indicate your relative fluency in the following languages by entering 1 for the most fluent to 3 for the least fluent (1=the most fluent language to 3=the least fluent)

A) In speech
i) Japanese  ii) English iii) Other (Please specify)

B) In writing
i) Japanese  ii) English iii) Other (Please specify)

Japanese writing
a. Do you write in Japanese anything other than course assignments?

No  
Yes(specify): How frequently?  daily:  
weekly:  
monthly:  
What do you write?  

b. What types of writing do you perform in Japanese (check all that apply)? And how often?

diary for yourself: At least once a week, At least once a month, Rarely, None  
personal letters: At least once a week, At least once a month, Rarely, None  
business letters: At least once a week, At least once a month, Rarely, None  
essays or reports for courses you are taking at the university: At least once a week, At least once a month, Rarely, None  
essays or reports for newspaper of magazines: At least once a week, At least once a month, Rarely, None  
books (what types? how frequently?):  


c. Have you published anything in Japanese?
   No____
   Yes____(specify): _______________________________________________

d. How do you evaluate your writing proficiency in Japanese as compared to that of other students in this class?
   Excellent_____, Good_____, Fair_____, Poor_____

e. How do you evaluate your writing proficiency in Japanese as compared to that of native speakers of Japanese studying at a Japanese university?
   Excellent_____, Good_____, Fair_____, Poor_____

f. Do you have any specific problems in writing in Japanese? If so, please describe them.
   No_____  
   Yes_____(list): ___________________________________________________________________

**English writing**

a. What types of writing do you perform in English (check all that apply) And how often?
   __diary for yourself: At least once a week____, At least once a month____, Rarely____, None____
   __personal letters: At least once a week____, At least once a month____, Rarely____, None____
   __business letters: At least once a week____, At least once a month____, Rarely____, None____
   __essays or reports for courses you are taking at the university: At least once a week____, At least once a month____, Rarely____, None____
   __essays or reports for newspaper or magazines: At least once a week____, At least once a month____, Rarely____, None____
   __books (what types? how frequent?): ________________________________________________
   __other (what? how frequent?): _____________________________________________________

b. Have you published anything in English?
   No____
   Yes____(specify): _______________________________________________

c. How do you evaluate your writing in English as compared to that of native speakers of English in classes you take in English?
   Excellent_____, Good_____, Fair_____, Poor_____

d. Do you have any specific problems in writing English? If so, please describe them.
   No____
   Yes_____(list): ___________________________________________________________________
Writing in the language (if any) that you identified as ‘other’ at the beginning of this section III Question B (iii)

a. What types of writing do you perform in this language (check all that apply)? And how often?
   ___ diary for yourself: At least once a week ___, At least once a month ___, Rarely ___, None ___
   ___ personal letters: At least once a week ___, At least once a month ___, Rarely ___, None ___
   ___ business letters: At least once a week ___, At least once a month ___, Rarely ___, None ___
   ___ essays or reports for courses you are taking at the university:
      At least once a week ___, At least once a month ___, Rarely ___, None ___
   ___ essays or reports for newspaper or magazines:
      At least once a week ___, At least once a month ___, Rarely ___, None ___
   ___ books (what types? how frequent?): _____________________________________________
   ___ other (what? how frequent?): _____________________________________________

b. Have you published anything in this language?
   No ___
   Yes ___ (specify): ____________________________________________________________

c. How do you evaluate your writing proficiency in this language as compared to that of native speakers of this language studying at a university (e.g., native speakers of Chinese studying at a university in Taiwan)?
   Excellent ___, Good ___, Fair ___, Poor ___

d. Do you have any specific problems in writing this language? If so, please describe them.
   No ___
   Yes ___ (list): _________________________________________________________________

IV. Difficulties while writing in your L1 and Japanese

Please circle one number below to show your answer to each question.
1=always difficult, 2=usually difficult, 3=sometimes easy, sometimes difficult, 4=usually easy, 5=always easy

Japanese writing
A) When you write in Japanese is it easy or difficult for you:

a. to find appropriate words while you write? 1 2 3 4 5
b. to plan a text that you are going to write? 1 2 3 4 5
c. to think while you write? 1 2 3 4 5
d. to express your intended meaning clearly 1 2 3 4 5
e. while revising, to make changes to express your intended meaning more clearly? 1 2 3 4 5
f. while revising, to make the overall structure of your text more effective? 1 2 3 4 5
g. to identify linguistic errors in your text? 1 2 3 4 5
h. to correct the linguistic errors that you found? 1 2 3 4 5
i. to find information for your text? 1 2 3 4 5
j. Were the 6 questions above easy or difficult to answer? 1 2 3 4 5

English writing
B) When you write in that language, is it easy or difficult for you:
Writing in the language (if any) that you identified as 'other' in Section III (B)
c) When you write in this language is it easy or difficult for you:

a. to find appropriate words while you write? 1 2 3 4 5
b. to plan a text that you are going to write? 1 2 3 4 5
c. to think while you write? 1 2 3 4 5
d. to express your intended meaning clearly 1 2 3 4 5
e. while revising, to make changes to express your intended meaning more clearly? 1 2 3 4 5
f. while revising, to make the overall structure of your text more effective? 1 2 3 4 5
g. to identify linguistic errors in your text? 1 2 3 4 5
h. to correct the linguistic errors that you found? 1 2 3 4 5
i. to find information for your text? 1 2 3 4 5
j. Were the 6 questions above easy or difficult to answer? 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for answering all the questions.
Appendix E: JST Band Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Band Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOVICE</td>
<td>The novice-level is characterized by the ability to communicate minimally with learned material. The CST is designed for examinees who exceed this level. Any examinee not achieving the minimum ability to be rated at the Intermediate level will receive this rating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| INTERMEDIATE      | The intermediate level is characterized by the speaker’s ability to: 
• create with the language by combining learned elements, though primarily in a reactive mode; 
• initiate, minimally sustain, and close in a simple way basic communicative tasks; and 
• ask and answer question |
| Low               | Able to handle successfully a limited number of interactive, task-oriented and social situations. Misunderstanding frequently arise, but with repetition, the Intermediate-Low speaker can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors. |
| Mid               | Able to handle successfully a variety of uncomplicated, basic and communicative tasks and social situations. Although misunderstanding still arise, the Intermediate-Mid speaker can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors. |
| High              | Able to handle successfully most uncomplicated communicative tasks and social situations. The Intermediate-High speaker can generally be understood even by interlocutors not accustomed to dealing with speakers at this level, but repetition may still be required. |
| ADVANCED          | The Advanced level is characterized by the speaker’s ability to: 
• converse in a clearly participatory fashion--initiate, sustain, and bring to closure a wide variety of communicative tasks, including those that require an increased ability to convey meaning with diverse language strategies due to a complication or an unforeseen turn of events; 
• satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; and 
• narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse |
| Advanced-Plus     | In addition to demonstrating those skills characteristic of the Advanced level, the Advanced-Plus level speaker is able to handle a broad variety of everyday, school, and work situation. There is emerging evidence of ability to support opinions, explain in detail, and hypothesize. The Advanced-Plus speaker often shows remarkable fluency and ease of speech but under the demands of Superior -level, complex tasks, language may break down or prove inadequate. |
| SUPERIOR          | The Superior level is characterized by the speaker’s ability to: 
• participate effectively and with ease in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional, and abstract discourse strategies. |
| High-Superior     | This rating, which is not part of the ACTFL scale, is used in CST scoring for examinees who clearly exceed the requirements for a rating of Superior. A rating of High-Superior corresponds to a rating of 3+ to 5 on the scale used by the Interagency Language Roundtable of the U.S. Government. The CST is not designed to evaluate examinees above the ACTFL Superior level. |

Note. CST = JST and pre-JST combined (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1992)
Appendix F

Samples of the Coding of the Conference Transcripts for Topic Field

Italics with quotation marks indicate the passage read from the students’ written text. The students’ utterances in English were originally in English.

Language Use
Lexis
T: “Soshite jinrui wa banji o oboemasen” koko de jinru tte detekitakara chotto bikkurishita n dakedo, datte kore made zutto daigakusei no hanashi ga shooten datta wake desho? Nani ga itakatta no ka na? (In the passage, “And human being cannot remember everything”, I was surprised to see a word jinrui (human race) here since you have specifically discussing university students. Can you explain what you wanted to say?)

S: Hai (yes) I meant to say ...it’s not possible for humans to remember everything

T: A. dattara, ningen tte ieiba ii (Ah, in that case, ningen would be more suitable

Syntax
T: Eeto, daiichidanraku desukedo “Chiisaitoki kara josei wa dansei” no tokoro de “dansei no byodoo da to omotteita” koko de joshi no ‘no’ ga detekuru n dakedo, nanika hoka no joshi kagaetsuku kana? (Well, in the first paragraph, you say “Since I was small, men and women” Uh, look at the particle no here, “I thought women were equal to men” [grammatical inaccuracy in the original Japanese] Can you think of any other particle to use?

S: Dansee to josei wa

T: Soo desu ne (That’s right)

Content
Gist
T: Ano... Dainidanraku no hajime to daiichidanraku ga doit tunagatte iru no ka chyotto atsumeeshite moraemasu ka? Tsunagari ga chotto yoku wakaranakatta node (Um...Can you talk a bit about how the beginning of the second paragraph relates to the first paragraph? The link between the two is not all that obvious to me)

S: Demo ano aru jyugyou de wa, ano- koogi o tanoshimu koto ga dekinai to watashi wa omoimasu (um well you see in some classes, I don’t think students can enjoy lectures

T: A. soo desu ka? (Oh, really?)

S: Jyohoh ga annari ni mo ookute ano- kichinto nooto o kakanai a. to ..<seikoo> dekinai. Dakara futatsu no koto shinakereba naranai Dakara hitotsu wa ano-daigaku wa curriculum o chotto kaeta hoo ga ii, dakara ano kokoni kaita kedo ano- ...hitsuysoua jyohoh wa zenbu kyoukasho ni kaite aru kara, jibun de benkyoo dekiru. Demo omona point wa koogi de ano- ma discussion mitaima kanji de shita hoo ga ii desu ne  De, ano- ...sono ano ippo? Gakusei wa ano- ano, ano kono jyugyou tanoshii tanosiiimu to yuu kagae kata de class ni itta hoo ga ii to omoimasu (When there is too much information given, um, students have to take notes diligently, um, otherwise they cannot succeed. So they have to do two things at once [listening to a lecture while constantly taking notes]. So, for one thing, universities should change their curriculum, so um as I wrote here um students can study the necessary information in the textbooks
by themselves. But important points in the textbooks, um, should be dealt with in the lecture through discussion. um,... Well, um, on the other hand? Students would be better off if they go to a class thinking they should enjoy it.)

T: A. taikutsuda itte omowanaku itte? (Ah, you mean not going into lectures, thinking they are boring?)

S: Soo desu hai (Yes, that's right.)

T: Naruhodone. Eeto, ano, dakara, zenmenteki ni sono koogi tte yuu no wa ii te yutte iru wakefyanakute, iro, nanka koogi demo mondaiten ga aru n da keredomo jissai koogi tte yuu katachi ni natte irukara sorenara tanoshinde itte. riyoo dekiru koto wa riyoo shita hoo ga ii itte yuukoto desu yo ne (I see, Um, so, you are not saying unilaterally that lectures are good, but you are saying although lectures have their drawbacks, since you have to attend them, you might as well enjoy and take advantage of them, right?).

S: Hai. demo (Yes, but)

T: Un (Yes)

S: Sore wa saishuteke ni kaita ka doo ka wakaranai (In the end, I don't know whether I wrote that in my text)

T: Sore wa ano- kaito nai desu ne (Um it's not spelled out in your written text)

S: A. n, demo ano- nani o kaita kana? Ano- un. ma, sono shigoto girai wa onaji yoon mono desu ne. Dakara ano-..... ano- anmari chigau sekai to watashi wa omowanai. Dakara ironna hito wa gakkoo wa taikutsu da kedo ano- shigoto wa **** shigoto wa jibun no shigotoba wa jibun no gakkoo to zenzen betsuna mono ni omotte iru daroo to watashi wa [Um I wonder what I wrote, then [looking over his essay] Um, yeah, well, people who dislike thei jobs are like students who dislike going to school. So um...I don't think they are very different people. So I think many people may expect, their work life would be totally different from their schooling that was boring,)

T: A. naruhodo ne (I see)

S: Tabun ano- jibun no gakko no benkyoo ni taisuru taido o jibun no shigotoba ni mochiireru (Perhaps um these people carry over their [negative] attitudes towards studying at school to their work place)

T: Naruhodo ne (I see)

S: Mochiireru to omoimasu. Dakara ano- kono iroirona hito wa jibun no shigoto o a, kirai kirai ni naranai ano- yooni gakkoo bara ano- hajime baro sono ano- ii taido o tsukutta hoo ga ii desu ne (They would carry the [negative] attitude into their work life. So um these people need to um nurture a more positive attitude from the beginning while they are still at school)

T: Aa, soo yuu koto ga iiitai n dattara, ima itta koto o sakubun ni kakeba ii to omowkedo (If that's what you wanted to stress, spelling out the kind of things you said to me would make your text very effective)

S: Ookei (OK)

Discourse Organization
T: Jyaa, ichidanraku goto mitekimashoo ka. Shitsunon ga attara dondon shitekudasai ne Sorekara, nanika hanashitai koto ga attara, ittekudasai ne. Eeto, daichidanraku to
T: dainidanraku wa ii desu ka? Koko de kuraibu-san no iitai koto wa ano jyosei ga shigoto-suru no ni wa sansei tte iu koto desu yo ne Unn (Let's take a look at one paragraph at a time, shall we? If you have any questions, just go ahead and ask. If there is anything you want to talk about them, go ahead with it as well. Well how about the first and second paragraphs? Your general point here is um that you are supportive of women's participation in the labor force, isn't it? um)

S: A. kore wa mijikasugimasu ne moo sukoshi setsumeishita hoo ga ii desu ne (This [paragraph] is way too short, isn't it? [consisting of one short sentence], I should explain more, right?)

T: Soo desu ne Nande kuraibu-san ga josei no shakaishinshitsu ni sansei na no ka setsumeisuru to ii to omoimasu (I would think so. Um perhaps add another sentence explaining why you support working women would help)

S: Saigo no danraku to no thematic link o kaita hoo ga ii desu ne ( I should make the thematic link with the last paragraph clear, shouldn't I?)

T: A. soo desu ne (That sounds good)

Dual Theme

T: "Shitagatte kaisain anshin saseru kooka wa kyuuuryoo to fukurikoosei kara no setsumyaku o koenainara, akirakani kaisha no shuushinkoyoosideo haishi o uttaeru beki dearu", ichiban saigo no bun nani ga iitai no ka yoku wakaranakatta n da kedo ("Therefore if the effect of making employees feel secure does not involve cutting the cost of salaries and benefits, clearly, companies should also appeal to abolish the life-time employment system", Um about the last sentence [in the third paragraph] I wasn't too sure what you were trying to say).

S: Aa...koenainara [reads the passage to himself] (Well...not going beyond)

T: Jyaa. mazu "koenainara" made no tokoro o mite ikimashoo Koko made wa nani ga iitakatta no kana? (Well, let's start with the first part, up to "not going beyond" [the end of the first clause]. What were you trying to say here?)

S: A. dakara, kinoo jyugyoo de hanashimashita ne? A- a sono dakara tabun kono shuushin koyoo o haishi suruto shain ga minna nante yuu, suto o shite, sugoku waiwai sawaidari suruto tabun sono haishi o shinai hoo ga ii to omoimasu Tabun ano kono shuushinkoyoosideo o haishi shinai hoo ga ii to omoimasu (I mentioned about it yesterday in class, didn't I? Well, if [Japanese] companies eliminate the system of life-time employment, there may be, how shall I say it, strikes by employees... so perhaps I think it's better not to eliminate the life-time employment system).

T: Jyaa. koko de itte iru no wa, hai, shuushinkoyoosideo wa haishi shinai hoo ga ii to itte iru n desu ka? (Ok, then, you are saying here that companies shouldn't abandon life-time employment?)

S: Iya, chigau (No, that's not what I meant).

T: Chigau? (Oh?)

S: Ano- kojinteki ni wa dekireba shuushinkoyoosideo o haishi shita hoo ga ii to omoimasu Shikashi ano- imano shuushinkoyooo wa sugoku shain o manzoku sasete te ano- hontoni seisansrei no takasa wa shuushin koyoo, koyoo no okageda kara ano shuushinkoyoo o ano hoji shita hooga ii desu Demo moshika shitara sonna koto wa honto jyanai to omoimasu Dakara shuushinkoyooo o haishi shita hoo ga ii to omoimasu Demo watashi wa akirakanti kaisha.. Kaisha no shuushinkoyoosideo o haishi shita hoo ga ii to yuue to sore wa tabun shiya no semai, ano koto to omowaremasu Dakara chotto disclaimer iiitai
(Uh, personally I think it’s better to abandon life-time employment if that’s possible. But, uh, because of life-time employment, employees are content, uh, high production rate [in Japan] is to due to this system, it’s better um to keep it. But, this may be an illusion. That’s why I think it’s better to get rid of this system. Nonetheless, if I strongly argue that companies should abandon this system, I may come across as narrow-minded. That’s why I wanted to put a disclaimer).

T: A. dakara disclaimer no tokoro ga wakannakatta no ne, sono nante yuu no ka. "shitagatte kaishain o anshin saseru kooa wa, kyuuryoo to fukuri koosei kara no setsuyaki o koenainara, .." dakara .7. sorekara yoku wakannakatta no wa kaisha ga dooshite shuushin koyooseido no haishi o uttaeru no ka dare ni uttaeru no ka ga yoku wakannai shi nande uttaeru no ka mo yoku wakannai (Ah, right, I suppose the disclaimer part was what I had difficulty grasping. [Reading the passage] Why were you saying that companies should make an appeal to abandon the life-time employment system? I’m not too clear to whom, how, and why they should appeal...)

S: A. uttaeru tabun uttaeru wa tekitoojyanai. Dakara keieisha wa nani mo uttaenai ne (Ah, then, perhaps “appeal” is not an appropriate word here, since it’s not the companies that appeal).

T: Soo desu ne (Right).

S: Ookei kaisha wa seido no haishi o ano- haishi, haishino hoo e muku beki Funikitta. funikiu beki? (OK How about companies should abandon, should move toward abandoning, ventured, venture to move toward abandoning life-time employment ?)

T: Aa, sorenara wakarimasu (Ah, that makes sense).

Meta Comments
S: Ano. kono sakubmn de dearu-style o tsukaoo to shita (Um in this composition, I tried to use “dearu” style [characteristics of expository writing] as much as possible [rising intonation])

T: Aa, soo desu ka (Uuhh)

S: Demo. seikooshita ka kooka wakaranai (But I’m not sure whether I succeeded or not )

T: Naruhodo ne jyaa sakubum mite-ikimashoo ka? (I see. Let’s take a look at your composition and see how you did)
### Appendix G: Coding Samples for the Function of Embedded Exchanges

Functions: 1 = communication failure; 2 = form-related problem; 3 = reformulation; 4 = confirmation request; 5 = completion of other-utterance; and 6 = other-correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Sample Utterance</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suminasen (Sorry?: Pardon?)</td>
<td>&quot;Sorry?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ee? (What?: Pardon?)</td>
<td>&quot;What?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moo ichido (Can you repeat it?)</td>
<td>&quot;Can you repeat?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T: &quot;Shyakaiikatsudoo&quot; te nani? Hooshimitai ni kikoerukedo (What did you mean by &quot;social activities&quot;? It sounds a bit like volunteer work)</td>
<td>S: Hoosti itte? (What's hooshi?)</td>
<td>T: Boruntia de shakai ni kookensuru koto (contributing to society by volunteering work) S: A soo (Oh, I see)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dakara shakuhoo jyanai hito wa (So, unsociable people) [incorrect word]</td>
<td>S: Dakan unsociable people (As I said, unsociable people) T: Aa, shakooteki jyanai hito (In Japanese, it's XX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dakara sakubum kaiteru to, nanka hoka no ikata? motto refined or sophisticated? (So when I write Japanese compositions, other expressions? more refined or sophisticated?)</td>
<td>S: Senrensareta</td>
<td>T: Senrensareta ikata ga anmari yoku wakannai node sugoku basic na vocabulary shika nai (As I don't know refined expression in Japanese, I end up using basic vocabulary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T: &quot;Futaatabi hatarakittai josei ni totte wa taihen deareu&quot; Kore ne, nani ga taihen na no? (About this passage &quot;for those women who want to work again is difficult&quot;, what's difficult for them?) S: Ooo... (Oh...) T: Dakara, koso da o shiteite nannenkan no buranku ga aru josei ni totte shakaisuukisuru toki taihen na no wa donna koto na no? (So, some women took some years off from work due to child-rearing. For those women, what may be difficult when they return to work?) S: Joohoo no ryo (the amount of information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S: Thier life in university um Daigakuseikatsu O? [student trying out the target expression in Japanese] T: Soo desu ne (Uhhuh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T: Ima itta koto wakatta? (Did you understand what I just said?) S: Hai (Yes)</td>
<td>S: Ima no system de wa sono taido o toru to fugookaku ni naru (Under the present system, this attitude will lead you to failure) T: Jya, gakusei da ke ga warui n jya nai no ne? (Then, it's not only these students who are at fault, right?) S: Un so (yeah)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T: Jya, kyoikeksusa no naka ni koogi ga ichiban ii kyoojyuhoo (So, some of the educators lecture is the best way to teach) S: Kyoojyuhoo da to omou (Some think lecture is the best way to teach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Um dakagakuseikatsu O (their life in university)? T: Soo desu ne (Uhhuh) De, kanada no daigakusei wa daigakuseikatsu NO KOTO O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H: Essay Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicative Quality</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Argumentation</th>
<th>Linguistic accuracy</th>
<th>Linguistic appropriacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The writing displays an ability to communicate with few difficulties for the reader</td>
<td>The writing displays a good organizational structure which enables the message to be followed throughout.</td>
<td>Arguments are well presented with relevant supporting material and an attempt to relate them to the writer's experience or views.</td>
<td>The reader is aware of but not troubled by occasional minor errors of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation or grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The writing displays an ability to communicate although there is occasional strain for the reader.</td>
<td>The writing displays a good organizational structure which enables the message to be followed throughout.</td>
<td>Arguments are presented but it may be difficult for the reader to distinguish main ideas from supporting material; main ideas may not be supported; their relevance may be dubious; arguments may not be related to the writer's experience or views.</td>
<td>The reader is aware of errors of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation or grammar, but these intrude only occasionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The writing displays an ability to communicate although there is often strain for the reader.</td>
<td>The writing is organized well enough for the message to be followed throughout.</td>
<td>Arguments are presented but may lack relevance, clarity, consistency or support; they may not be related to the writer's experience or views.</td>
<td>The reader is aware of errors of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation or grammar, but these intrude frequently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The writing displays a limited ability to communicate which puts strain on the reader throughout.</td>
<td>The writing is organized well enough for the message to be followed most of the time.</td>
<td>Arguments are inadequately presented and supported; they may be irrelevant; if the writer's experience or views are presented their relevance may be difficult to see</td>
<td>The reader finds the control of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation or grammar inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The writing does not display an ability to communicate which puts strain on the reader throughout.</td>
<td>The writing has no discernible organizational structure and a message cannot be followed.</td>
<td>Some elements of information are present but the reader is not provided with an argument, or the argument is mainly irrelevant.</td>
<td>The reader is primarily aware of gross inadequacies of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation or grammar inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The writing displays no ability to communicate.</td>
<td>No organizational structure or message throughout</td>
<td>A meaning comes through occasionally but it is not relevant.</td>
<td>The reader sees no evidence of control of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation or grammar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from "Reconstructing 'academic writing proficiency'" (Hamp-Lyons, 1991, pp. 149-151)
## Appendix I: Examples of Revision Rating for Scope and Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope/Phrase</th>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group/Phrase</td>
<td>jiken (an incident)*</td>
<td>jijimondai (current affairs)</td>
<td>Lexis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kagiru jikan (limiting time)*</td>
<td>kagirareta jikan (limited time)</td>
<td>Morpho-Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oomukashi (long time ago)</td>
<td>kodai (ancient times)</td>
<td>Textual Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>ie wa tenkeikekina chantoshita kazoku no kao desu kara [because home is a typical proper face of the family]</td>
<td>kaji ya ikujii wa daiji na shigoto desu kara [because house work and child raising are important jobs]</td>
<td>Textual Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koogo o kikudake, jijitsu o oboeru* [only listening to lectures and memorize facts]</td>
<td>koogo o koki jijitsu o oboerdakedattara, shikoorokyu wa fuenai [If one only listen to lectures and memorizes facts, the ability to think would not be nurtured]</td>
<td>Rewriting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Sentence (a) addition/deletion</td>
<td>Koogo wa taikutsu da to iu hito ga sukunakunakurakabaru. Shikashi, kookateki ni ryoosaretta koogo wa tanoshii kihontekina benkyoohohoo ni nareru mono de shoorai no shigoto no yaku ni tatsu. Shigotogirai wa saikin no ookiina shakaimondai da to omou.</td>
<td>(First paragraph unchanged) <strong>Shikashi, aru jyuugyo wa takusan no jyohon o osierutameni, gakusei no chishiki o tsunekot de shimau. Kono seto wa jyuukyoo o tanoshimenakute kurasu o taikutsu da to hinan suru. Seito wa kono taido o shoorai no shigoto ni taishite no motte shigoto girai ni natte shimau.</strong> Shigotogirai wa saikin no ookiina shakaimondai da to omou.</td>
<td>Content/Discourse Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) rearrangement</td>
<td>Keiyaku no shigoto wa sukoshi fuunrantei dore. Tsugi no shigoto wa shiranai. Kaisha no nenkin ya kenkoohohon ga nai kata. Shuushinkayoo dekinai dore. [Working on contract is a bit unstable. One doesn’t know about the net job. Also (unstable) because there are no provision of pension and health insurance].</td>
<td>Tsugi no shigoto wa wakaranai shi, kaisha no nenkin ya kenkoohohon ga nai kara keiyaku no shigotoseikatsu wa sukoshi fuun dore. [Because one doesn’t know about the next job and there are no provision of pension and health insurance, working on contract is a bit unstable].</td>
<td>Content/Discourse Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) macro-level</td>
<td>This type of revision, involving paragraph-level revisions (e.g., adding paragraphs; rearranging paragraphs) occurred almost exclusively in June’s compositions. Examples of paragraph-level revisions are presented on the next two pages in original Japanese.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Content/Discourse Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix J: Examples of Coding for Correspondence Analysis

EXAMPLE A: 3 CATEGORIES OF CORRESPONDENCE & 1 UNLINKED REVISION

Example of Revision in Jim's Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1'Zeminaaru wa 2'rekuchaa to 3'ittaiichi to no chuukan 4'desu. 5'Zeminaaru ni sankasuru gakusei wa sukunaikara desu.</td>
<td>1'Zemi wa 2'koogi to 3'kojinriyou to no chuukan 4'de, 5'shooninzusei desu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Seminars are between lecture and one-on-on. Because students who participate in seminars are small).</td>
<td>(Seminars are between lecture and individual use because it cater a small number of students).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Numbers in superscript = one token of revision*

Conference Transcripts

T stands for teacher and S for student; English words in the utterance were originally in English.

Extrapolated from One Example

Revision 1

Sequence 4, Topic Field = Lexis

While this revision point was discussed once at the beginning of Sequence of 4, Jim changed the word rekuchaa to koogi 11 times in the text.

• One Revision Point

T: *Saisho no bun, "hotono do no gakusei ni totte wa, rekuchaa o" no tokoro ne, koogi tte yuu hyoogen o futsuu wa tsukaimasu ne? Rekuchaa tte eigo no kotoba desho?* (The first sentence, the word koogi (lecture) would be more commonly used than rekuchaa in Japanese. The word, rekuchaa, is an English word, isn't it?)*

S: *Koogi?*

T: *Soo desu ne (Right) Koogi*

S: *Koogi* (sequence continues)

Revision 2

Sequence 20, Topic Field = Lexis

(The same revision point was discussed in at the end of Sequence 12 briefly. However, since there was no student uptake in Jim's conference talk, the teacher came back to the same point in Sequence 20). Jim changed the word zeminaaru into zemi 7 times in the text.

• 1 Revision Point Discussed

T: *Ao, "zeminaaru" demo ii n desu kedo, demo daigaku no tuutoriaru toka seminaa no baaidattara futsuu wa zemi tte yuu n desu yo ne (Um about the word, zeminaaru (seminar), this is fine, but the word zemi is more commonly, referring to university tutorials or seminars)*

S: *Ookei (OK)*

T: *Zeminaaru tte yuu kotoba arimasukara (Zeminaaru is a legitimate word, though)*
Explicitly Discussed and Incorporated in the Writing, although Displaying Inaccuracy

Revision 3
Sequence 21. Topic Field = Lexis
Instead of the appropriate word suggested in the conference, kojinshidoo (one-on-one instruction), in his final draft, Jim writes kojinriyou (individual use), which means something very different, neither appropriate nor accurate in this context.

• 1 Revision Point Discussed
T: "Eeto, "Seminara wa lekuchaa to itai ichi no chuukan de" Kojinshidoo tte yuu koto ga itakatta na kana?" (Well, about the passage, "The seminar is in-between lecture and one-on-one" Did you mean 'individual tutoring' by the expression *ittaci ichi*)

S: Hai (Yes)

T: Dattara, kojinshidoo tte itta hoo ga ii desu ne (In that case, it's better to say kojinshidoo)

S: Kojinshidoo?

T: Unnto . 4 shidoosuru tte yuu no wa oshiteru tte yuu koto, sorekara kojinriki tte yuu no wa mantsuuman no koto dakara tsunageruto kojinshidoo te yuu (Um . 4 . Shidoosuru means 'to instruct' and kojinriki means 'one-on-one' To put them together, you have kojinshidoo (one-on-one instruction)

S: Kojinshidoo Kojinshidoo OOkei

Explicitly Discussed and Incorporated in the Writing Verbatim

Revision 5
Sequence 22. Topic Field = Lexis

• 1 Revision Point Discussed
T: "Eeto ano- " Zeminaaru ni sankasuru gakusei wa sukunaikara desu (Um well "Not many students attend seminars") [reading a passage verbatim from the written text]
S: Unto iiitakatta no wa (Um What I wanted to say was) the number of students attending seminars is smaller.

T: Soo desu ka. Soo shitaara shooninzuu tte yuu hyooogen o tsukattara ii n jyanai kana? (Right There is a phrase to say a small number of people, shooninzuu)

S: Shooninzuu.

T: Kono baaidattara, tabun shooninzuusei no hoo ga ii desu ne (In this case, perhaps shooninzuusei would be better) Zemi wa shooninzuusei desu (Seminars are [carried out] with a smaller number of students).

S: OK

Unlinked Revision

Revision 4
In his final draft, Jim combines two sentences into one, making his text more readable and concise.
Type of revision made = textual effectiveness.

EXAMPLE B: 3 REVISION POINTS DISCUSSED IN ONE SEQUENCE RESULTING IN 3 VERBATIM REVISIONS

Example of Revision in Chris' Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan no daigaku yori, kanada no daigaku wa muzukashii noka, kanana no 1digakusei no 2seikatsu wa motto 3shimpaishimasu.</td>
<td>Taiwan no daigaku yori, kanada no daigaku wa muzukashii node, kanana no daigakusei wa 2daigakuseikatsu no koto o motto 3shimpaishite-imasu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may that Canadian universities are more demanding than Taiwanese universities, university students in Canada worry more about their university lives.</td>
<td>Since Canadian universities are more demanding than Taiwanese universities, university students in Canada are worried about their university lives more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in superscri = one token of revision

Explicitly Discussed and Incorporated in the Writing Verbatim

Sequence 24, Topic Field=morpho-syntax

Revision 1

• First Revision Point [the use of particle]

T: "Kanada no daigausétu no seikatsu wa" [reading the passage in the first draft], sekatsu ga shimpai-suru n desu ka? ("university students' life in Canada", is it life that worries?)

S: It's... (It's...)

T: Dare ga shimpaishite-irun desu ka? (Who is worried?)

S: Aa- daigausétu Kanada no daigakusee wa?(Ah. university students Canadian university students)

T: Soo desu ne.

Revision 2
Second Revision Point [the use of particle]

T: Sorede, kadada no daigakusei wa nani nan no koto o shinpai shite-iru n desu ka? (Right ..um..uh, what what are these Canadian university students worried about?)

S: Un... (Um)

T: Seiseki desu ka? Soretomo daigakuseikatsu no koto? (Their grades or their life in university?)

S: their life in university um daigakuseikatsu O [object-marking particle]? (That's right. Canadian students about their university life)

Revision 3

Third Revision Point [the use of verb: aspect]

S: Hai daigakuseikatsu no koto o shinpai shihmasu (Yes they worry about their university life)

T: Uun shinpai suru u ni no wa doo kana? (Um is “worry” appropriate here?)

S: Shinpai shite-imasu (be worried)

T: Un soo desu ne. Shinpai shite-iru desu ne. (That’s right, be worried)

S: OK

Unlike Revision from noka (to do with) to node (because)

EXAMPLE C: 2 TYPES OF CORRESPONDENCE INCLUDING THE “LINGUISTIC MODEL PROVIDED IN THE CONFERENCE TALK” CATEGORY

Example of Revision in Ewan’s Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...wadai no 1daijiten ga 2hakiri 3wakarareru</td>
<td>...wadai no 1daiji na ten ga 2hakkiri 3wakaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the importance of the subject is understood</td>
<td>...one can understand the importance of the subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in superscript = one token of revision; Draft 1 contains ungrammatical expressions, “daijiten” and “wakarareru”, and an mispronunciation of the word.

Linguistic model provided in the conference talk without explicit discussion

Revision 2

The teacher provides a linguistic model (hakkiri instead of hakiri) in the conference talk

Explicitly Discussed and Incorporated in the Writing Verbatim

Sequence 11, Topic Field = Morpho-Syntax

Revision 1 and 3

* 2 revision points discussed

T: A no daiji te yuu tokorodakedo kore na-keiyooshi dakara daiji no ato niwa na ga irimasu ne daijina ‘daijina ten ga hakkirishite’ desu ne Eeto sorekara kore wa reigaina n dakedo wakaru o baai wa koonokei
wa toranai no ne (About the expression daiji (important) since it is a na-adjective, it’s better to put na after daiji um so ‘important points clearly’. right? Well, this is an exception to the rule, but when one uses the verb wakaru (understand), one doesn’t use “be able to” form)

S: OK na o yoku wasuremasu Demo warareru wa dame desu ka? (OK I tend to forget to add na..but there isn’t such expression as wakarareru?)

T: Soo desu ne ano- ‘hakkiri wakaru’ jyanai to hen desu ne (Uhuh um so here it should be hakkiri wakaru)

S: So wakaru means both to understand and can understand

T: Soo desu ne (Yes)

EXAMPLE D: SUBSTANTIVE REVISION BASED ON GENERAL DISCUSSION

Example of Revision in Edward’s Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First paragraph</th>
<th>Second paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First draft</td>
<td>I think that loathing toward one’s own job is a big social problem. Shigotogirai (loathing one’s jobs) is a word that I created, which means persisting in working to make money in spite of their loathing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, lectures that are used effectively can be an enjoyable means of studying and be helpful in preparing for one’s future work.</td>
<td><strong>However, in some classes, in order to teach a great deal of information, the tendency is to pack students with too much information. This results in students not enjoying classes and criticizing them as boring. As they carry over the same negative attitude toward their future work, this may lead to their loathing of their own jobs.</strong> I think that loathing toward one’s own job is a big social problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Double asterisks indicate the sentences added after the conference discussion; Edward’s writing was translated from Japanese to English; for the original Japanese version, please refer to Appendix I.

General Correspondence

Based on the discussion in Sequence 7, Edward appeared to make substantive revisions by adding three sentences at the beginning of the second paragraph. He successfully addressed the problem discussed in this sequence (coherent argument; transition from the first and second paragraphs). The discussion in the conference sequence presented below focused on clarity of meaning without concrete alternative expressions.

Task 2, Sequence 7, Gist

T: Ano... Dainidanraku no hajime to daiichidanraku ga doo tsunagatte iru no ka chyotto setsumeeshite moraemasu ka? Tsunagari ga chotto yoku wakaranakatta node (Um...Can you talk a bit about how the beginning of the second paragraph relates to the first paragraph? The link between the two is not all that obvious to me)

S: Demo ano aru fyugudo de wa, ano- koogi o tanoshimu koto ga dekinai to watashi wa omoimasu (um well you see in some classes, I don’t think students can enjoy lectures

T: A. soo desu ka? (Oh, really?)

S: Jyoohoo ga anmari ni mo ookute ano- kichinto nooto o kakanai a. to ..<seikoo> dekinai. Dakara hitotsu no koto shinakereba naranai Dakara hitotsu wa ano- daigaku wa curriculum o chotto kaeta hoo ga ii, dakara ano kokoni kaita kedo ano- ...hitsuyanoa jyoohoo wa zenbu kyookasho ni kaito aru kara, jibun de benkyoo dekiru. Demo omona point wa koogi de ano- ma discussion mitaina kanji de shita
hoo ga ii desu ne  De, ano-...sono ano ippo? Gakusei wa ano-ano, ano kono jyugyou tanoshii tanoshimu to yuu kangae kata de class ni itta hoo ga ii to omoimasu (When there is too much information given, um, students have to take notes diligently, um, otherwise they cannot succeed. So they have to do two things at once [listening to a lecture while constantly taking notes]. So, for one thing, universities should change their curriculum, so um as I wrote here um students can study the necessary information in the textbooks by themselves. But important points in the textbooks, um, should be dealt with in the lecture through discussion. um,... Well, um, on the other hand? Students would be better off if they go to a class thinking they should enjoy it)

T: A, taikutsuda tte omowanaku tte? (Ah, you mean not going into lectures, thinking they are boring?)

S: Soo desu hai (Yes, that's right.)

T: Naruhodo ne. Eeto, ano, dakara. zenmenteki ni sono koogi tte yuu no wa iitte yutte iru wakejyanakute. iro. nanka koogi demo mondaiten ga aru n da keredomo jissai koogi tte yuu katachi ni natte irukara sorenara tanoshinde itte, riyou dekiru koto wa riyooshita hoo ga ii tte yuu koto desu yo ne (I see, Um, so, you are not saying unilaterally that lectures are good, but you are saying although lectures have their drawbacks, since you have to attend them, you might as well enjoy and take advantage of them, right?).

T: Sore wa ano- kaite nai desu ne (Um it's not spelled out in your written text)

S: A, n. demo ano- nani o kaita kana? Ano- un. ma, sono shigoto girai wa onaji yoona mono desu ne. Dakara ano-... ano-anmari chigau sekai to watashi wa omowanai. Dakara ironna hito wa gakkoo wa taikustu da kedo ano- shigoto wa **** shigoto wa jibun no shigotoba wa jibun no gakkoo to senzen betsuna mono ni omotte iru daroo to watashi wa (Um I wonder what I wrote, then [looking over his essay] Um, yeah, well, people who dislike their jobs are like students who dislike going to school. So um...I don’t think they are very different people. So I think many people may expect, their work life would be totally different from their schooling that was boring.)

S: Tabun ano- jibun no gakkoo no benkyoo ni taisuru taido o jibun no shigotoba ni mochiireru (Perhaps um these people carry over their [negative] attitudes towards studying at school to their work place)

S: Mochiireru to omoimasu. Dakara ano- kono iroirona hito wa jibun no shigoto o a, kirai kirai ni naranai ano- yooni gakkoo kara ano- hajime kara sono ano- ii taido o tsukutta hoo ga ii desu ne (They would carry the [negative] attitude into their work life. So um these people need to um nurture a more positive attitude from the beginning while they are still at school)

S: Ookei (OK)